

THE

SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 990, Vol. 38.

October 17, 1874.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE SPANISH NOTE.

THE Note addressed by the Spanish Minister to the French Government derives importance, not from the specific allegations which it contains, but from the fact that it has been deliberately presented. It is now evident that Marshal MACMAHON and Count CHAUDORDY were fully justified in the coldness of the language in which their diplomatic recognition was conveyed. The tone of the Spanish Note is neither explained nor excused by the previous communication in which the Duke DECAZES had asked for particulars of alleged violations of neutrality. It was unnecessary to comply in detail with a formal demand, or to refer to instances of negligence which may have been committed two or three years ago. Above all, it was invidious and unfriendly to address reproaches to a Government which had within a few days consented, with some sacrifice of national feeling, to follow the lead of Germany in recognizing Spain. The form of address which was adopted by the French Minister in concert with his English colleague was more proper and more respectful than the personal title by which alone the German and Austrian representatives addressed the head of the Government. A recognition accorded to the Duke of LA TORE might be withdrawn or withheld at pleasure from any successor to his office. Mr. LAYARD and Count CHAUDORDY were accredited to the Chief of the Executive Power, who probably may himself have preferred the omission of any notice of the Republic. The formal address of the French Minister was not discourteous, though it may have been dry; and it is remarkable that Mr. LAYARD'S more effusive expressions of friendship have formed the subject of spiteful comment in the journal which is supposed to express the policy of the Spanish Government. The hope that the national feeling would find free utterance is represented as an impertinence on the part of a foreigner; and the official writer even indulges in wild speculations of an alliance to be formed by England, France, and Russia against Spain. It is not surprising that political speculators should amuse themselves with conjectures of the share which Prince BISMARCK may have had in the Spanish remonstrance. If it were the object of Germany to inflict useless annoyance on France, an affront offered to the Government of Marshal MACMAHON by the most helpless State in Europe would perhaps be welcome at Berlin. Prince BISMARCK is incapable of seeking indirectly to insult a neighbour whom he has no present purpose or opportunity of injuring.

The irritation which a Government engaged in civil war feels against a neutral who is supposed to favour the insurgents may be readily understood and forgiven. The French, indeed, have more than once stated in answer to similar complaints that a larger proportion of warlike stores is introduced into Spain by sea than by land; and it may easily be believed that English adventurers are active wherever money is to be made. The Spanish naval officers are suspected of disaffection, and their vigilance is undoubtedly imperfect. It is not the duty of French cruisers to intercept vessels laden with arms or ammunition in Spanish waters; and smugglers know that whenever the weather becomes rough the harbours on the Northern coast will be left unwatched by the Spanish squadron. Marshal SERRANO and his Ministers would probably reply that they are well assured of the friendly disposition of the English Government, and that it has no means of preventing a contraband trade on the coast of Spain. The French are close at hand, and it is notorious that a large part of the border population, including some official persons,

favour the cause of the Carlists. One of the allegations in the Spanish Note might have been almost understood as an excuse for the French authorities. It is asserted that many of the small-arms which remained in the hands of private persons after the German war have found their way across the frontier. As an interval of more than three years has elapsed since the disbandment of the Free Corps and the Mobile Guards, the traffic in muskets clandestinely retained by irregular levies has probably long since ceased. The long line of the Pyrenees, with their numerous passes, is almost as favourable to illicit traffic as the Northern coast. It is not pretended that any arms have passed from the possession of the French Government into the hands of the Carlists. When the Fenian conspirators on more than one occasion attempted to invade Canada, they were allowed by the local authorities to break open public arsenals for the purpose of procuring arms; yet the English Government prudently abstained from preferring complaints which would not have procured redress.

The impolicy of the Spanish remonstrance is not less conspicuous than the want of courteous consideration which it displays. If the French FOREIGN MINISTER thinks fit simply to refuse any explanation in answer to a peremptory demand, Marshal SERRANO must submit in silence to a merited rebuff. It is hardly probable that he would be guilty of the imprudence of recalling his Minister from Paris immediately after he has with difficulty secured a long-delayed recognition. Any menace of retaliation or reprisal would be absurd and impossible. Notwithstanding recent losses and humiliations, France is as far superior in power to Spain at the present moment as in the palmiest days of the Empire. The Government of Madrid, which is unable to cope with a comparatively insignificant rebellion, has no force to spare for a foreign quarrel. Even if war between France and Germany were as imminent as it is remote and improbable, the French Government would be a more formidable enemy to Spain than the greatest Power at a distance. A French army could march almost without opposition, as in the days of the Duke of ANGOULÊME, from Bayonne to Cadiz. At present there is no ground of quarrel between France and Germany; and both nations need repose. If the Spaniards were so unwise as to provoke the hostility of their powerful neighbour, they would have to bear the consequences. In such a contest all parties in France would for once be united, for the supposed dependence of Spain on German support has rendered the Republicans almost as favourable as the Legitimists to the cause of DON CARLOS. Marshal MACMAHON'S Government might formerly have been blamed for employing on the Southern frontier Prefects and other functionaries of Royalist sympathies. But the formal demand of Spain for a change in the local administration will be resented as an inadmissible attempt at dictation. It is for the French Government to determine the method by which satisfaction may, if necessary, be given to Spain. The suggestion that one or more Prefects shall be dismissed will be deemed an unwarrantable intrusion. If the French Government desires popularity, it has only to hint that it is thwarting a German intrigue.

In inviting a dispute the Spanish Government probably relies rather on its weakness than on its strength. France will give the Carlists no direct assistance, though a diminution of the limited good will which has hitherto been exhibited by the officials on the frontier might have inconvenient results. The external action of a weak Government often admits of a domestic explanation. Marshal

SERRANO or SEÑOR SAGASTA may perhaps have hoped to revive by an appeal to national feeling the popularity which has of late sensibly diminished. When SERRANO returned to Madrid after the relief of Bilbao, in which he had ostensibly shared, strong hopes were entertained that the insurrection was at last tending to a close. The defeat and death of CONCHA before Estella was a severe disappointment; and the loss has never been retrieved. Since that time several checks have been experienced, and no considerable success has been achieved. It is alleged that SERRANO appointed LASERNA to the chief command in the North through jealousy of MORIONES. It is certain that the slackness of one or both of the generals prevented the recovery of Estella, and partially defeated the attempt to revictual Pampeluna. The Carlists on their part are weaker and not less divided, but the prolongation of the struggle excites just dissatisfaction. There are unemployed generals in Spain who may reasonably think themselves equal or superior in capacity to SERRANO, who earned his early promotion nearly forty years ago by services which were not of a military nature. PAVIA, who established the present Government, is no longer engaged in active service; and perhaps MORIONES might command the suffrages of the army. It is also probable that civilian candidates for power would be not unwilling to undermine the supremacy of SAGASTA. The Republicans who a year ago governed Spain without resistance have apparently subsided into inaction and obscurity. If there is any public opinion left in Spain, it may perhaps be temporarily stimulated and gratified by the spirited language of the Note which has been addressed to the French Government. As a diplomatic measure, the communication is an unqualified blunder. If France bears ill will to the Spanish Republic, an excuse for unfriendly conduct will render apologies unnecessary.

CURRENT POLITICS.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON has been addressing his friends of the United Kingdom Alliance at Manchester in a vein not only of cheerful equanimity but of the highest good spirits. The times are, he thinks, bright and sunshiny. One great difficulty that used to beset him has vanished. It used to be objected to him that he and those who supported him were smashing the Liberal party, but this objection, at any rate, cannot now be urged. He cannot smash the Liberal party, for the Liberal party is smashed. It is altogether done for, gone out of sight, dead and buried. Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, than whom Sir WILFRID LAWSON could not wish a higher authority, has publicly stated that the Liberal party has no programme. The ground is therefore quite clear for Sir WILFRID LAWSON, and he feels so very happy. He contrasts his rising star with the paling lustre of Mr. GLADSTONE's fortunes. The late PRIME MINISTER came back from the elections with a large majority turned into a large minority, but Sir WILFRID LAWSON positively gained by the elections. He now commands two more supporters than he could boast of in the last Parliament. Last Session ninety-two members voted for the Permissive Bill, and the way is clear before this gallant band and their chief. With this splendid opening, with the consciousness of growing strength to cheer them, with no political obstacles to hamper them, what are they to do? Sir WILFRID LAWSON puts their one duty and aim unmistakably before them. They are to unfurl a moral flag. This is a proud, a noble—and, it may be added, not a dangerous—thing to do, and it shall be done bravely and resolutely. They can shake their banner in the face of vice, and what will be the effect? Why, as their chief justly says, every one who likes to see a banner so shaken will enjoy the spectacle. It makes no matter from this point of view that a minority of ninety-two is not at all likely to pass the Permissive Bill, or that the Permissive Bill is open, even in the judgment of many who vote for it, to serious, if not insuperable, objections. As Sir WILFRID LAWSON points out, people who support the Permissive Bill are not pledged to any details. They may even think that the Bill would be a very bad Bill if carried. The goodness or badness of a particular measure is perfectly immaterial. The great thing is to unfurl the flag, to let it be known that there are high-minded men who object to drunkenness and who dare to oppose the publicans. Only suppose, as Sir WILFRID LAWSON urged, that the United Kingdom Alliance did not go on waving its banner, how

triumphant the publicans would be! This shows that it must be wise and right to wave the flag; and then waving a flag is a comforting process to those who wave it, and saves a world of trouble. When the Permissive Bill is held up on high by its author, not as a scheme of practical legislation, but as a symbol of disgust at other people intoxicating themselves, this spares its supporters all the wearisome work of thinking how it could be carried, how it would work, what good it would do, whether it would do more good or harm. Nor is it only those who support the Permissive Bill who will gain by having the true significance of the measure explained to them. Those who oppose it will be equally relieved. There can be no call to argue seriously against a Bill which is recognized as being nothing but a banner; we at once escape from considering all the inherent difficulties of the measure, the tyranny of local majorities, the precedent of the United States, and so forth. This is not, as we now know, the right way to look at the Bill. What is called the Permissive Bill is really a Bill for allowing every decent Englishman to declare solemnly that he heartily desires to see his neighbours sober. If this is thoroughly understood, we do not see why Sir WILFRID LAWSON should not look forward to a splendid success, and why his minority should not grow much more rapidly towards a majority than that of Mr. GLADSTONE.

Mr. STANSFELD also has taken to unfurling his moral flag, and is waving the reddest flag he can find in the face of those who support the Contagious Diseases Acts. He considers it a good thing to make these Acts the subject of popular discussion. He admires the ladies who go about lecturing on one of the most disgusting subjects that could occupy the mind of a woman. And he, too, has the way clear before him, for those who think he is wrong will not answer him, or stoop to enter into the details of so uninviting an inquiry. If he likes to wave his flag, he must wave it. All that need be said is that this waving of moral flags is a cheap, an easy, and it must be remembered a very familiar, process. It is so simple—to leave out of consideration all the practical difficulties of life, to take the high and mighty line, and to identify crotchets with Christianity. From our cradles we have all been accustomed to hear the objection to an army that it is a machinery for hiring Christians to commit murder for a shilling a day, and the objection to an Established Church that the apostles managed to make converts without enjoying incomes of 5,000*l.* a year. Governments with real responsibility on them cannot regard life with this primitive straightforwardness, and must be content to trust that what is really required for the health and security of a people is also the most in harmony with Christianity. But if Governments are fettered, ex-Ministers who belong to a smashed party without a programme are as free as air, and Mr. STANSFELD is as ready as Sir WILFRID LAWSON to ask the constituencies to do nothing but look at his red flag when they are next asked to vote. This seems a very poor way of proceeding for a man who a few months ago was a Cabinet Minister. If Mr. STANSFELD had chosen to proceed in a proper way, he might easily have done so. He says that he can show that the Acts do not produce the particular benefit which they were intended to produce. If the fact be so, it is a most important fact, and would have due weight with Parliament. But if Mr. STANSFELD were to assert this in Parliament, and succeed in obtaining an inquiry into the matter, he would have to do something very different from unfurling a flag, and proclaiming himself a Christian, and sympathizing with ladies who throw off the modesty of their sex. He would have to confront medical and naval and military witnesses, and would have to come to facts and proofs. It might be that he would prove his point; but he would have to prove it; and to convince a Committee of business-like men discussing with practical aims, and because it is their duty to discuss it, a disagreeable subject, is a much harder thing than to discuss the subject before a mixed audience, to appeal to the prejudices of women on a matter of which it is to be hoped they are utterly ignorant, and to announce that the views of Mr. STANSFELD and the law of God are identical.

Mr. OTWAY is a good example of the vanquished Liberal who has no flag to unfurl, who recognizes that his party was thoroughly beaten at the last elections, who thinks that the defeat was greatly due to the errors of the Liberal leaders, and who, looking at things as they are, is very well content that the

Conservatives should be in office. This is a very sensible way of treating current politics; but that this should be the view of most Liberals who do not wish to see the party reunited by some spurious agitation being got up for an undesirable object, shows how completely smashed the party is for the present. If there were a chance of things turning in favour of the party, the unfurlers of flags might be induced to wave their banners for the moment in some very quiet and obscure corner; but so long as men like Mr. ORWAY think that the country gains by the Conservatives being in office, the Liberal party has nothing to begin upon, more especially as this opinion, we may be sure, is shared by a large portion of the late Cabinet. The Conservatives have only to go on doing their work as well as they can in a steady unambitious way. We perceive with pleasure that the HOME SECRETARY has one gift which is very useful to a man in his position. He knows when those with whom he confers have something really to say to him, and when they have not. Mr. CROSS has been paying a visit to Scotland, and among other subjects which have engaged his attention is that of the abolition of turnpike tolls. He received a deputation of eminent persons who favoured the abolition, and after hearing them, he explained to them that they had nothing to tell him. They merely set before him facts which are already contained in a Blue Book, and a Bill which has already been submitted to Parliament. What is practically to be done is the question, and if they could have suggested anything in this direction, he would have been delighted to hear it. To repeat information which he already possessed was a mere waste of time; and it was only in case of their having taken the trouble to think what lesson was to be deduced from this information that they could have helped him. They candidly told him that they innocently imagined that thinking was his business and not theirs. But Mr. CROSS would not stand this. If he was to be left to do all the thinking, he would do it as well as he could, but he wished it to be recorded that he quitted them on the understanding that they confessed they had not an idea among the whole lot of them. They were quite satisfied, and thanked him for the courtesy and kindness with which he had received them. If they were satisfied, the public may be satisfied too. It is not a bad sign for a Government when a Minister shows that he can take the exact measure of a deputation.

ITALY.

THE various Italian Ministries which succeed each other with somewhat inconvenient rapidity have no very great political differences to distinguish them, but each in turn has to encounter minor difficulties of a very embarrassing kind. The general policy of Italy is fixed, whoever may be in office. The vast majority of the nation is firmly bent on upholding the unity which has been won at so great a cost and in so surprising a manner, and there is no opposition worth noticing to the form of government. A few misguided zealots may get up an isolated movement in favour of a Republic, and GARIBALDI may issue his fulminations and decrees against his enemies after a fashion which strangely resembles that adopted by the person whom of all others he would least like to copy—the POPE. But the reactionary party and the Republican party, although they exist in Italy, and are not without some resources and influence, have no hold on the general body of electors; and although German unity rests in some ways on a surer foundation than Italian unity, because it has much more military strength to support it, yet there is less political division in Italy than there is in Germany. The religious question is less troublesome, as it touches temporal rather than spiritual interests, and the Italians as a rule are troubled with no scruples of conscience whatever as to the treatment which they have bestowed on the Church. If they reflect at all about it, it is to pique themselves on what they think the extreme, and perhaps foolish, generosity with which they have treated the POPE. As to the foreign policy of Italy, it is undeviating in its simplicity. It consists entirely in loving and courting and behaving well to every one when it is once recognized that Italy is to keep all she has got. And Italy is so lucky, and reaps so much benefit from having one simple line of policy, that something is always happening to remind the world of Italian suc-

cess. In utter defiance of France, and in complete disregard of the engagements which France had exacted, Italy seized on Rome. Without Italy having to raise a finger or spend a penny, Germany took on herself the trouble of going on fighting until the impunity of Italy was assured. As a slight protest against the wrongdoing of Italy the *Orénoque* was stationed at Civita Vecchia. Now the *Orénoque* is recalled, and the various organs of French opinion, though all inclined to abuse their own Government, concur in admiring the tact and kindness with which Italy has graciously allowed the MACMAHON Ministry to take its own time in paying this tribute to Italian ascendancy. Nor is this all. France is now, like Mr. COOK's tourists, going on a tour through Italy, conducted personally by M. THIERS; and M. THIERS, who for a dozen years was the persistent adversary of Italian unity, moves on from one Italian city to another assuring Italy how truly he loves her, and how much he rejoices in her success; and all that the Ministerial critics of M. THIERS have to say is that Italians ought not to love M. THIERS in return exclusively, but should condescend to remember that Marshal MACMAHON earned his staff and his dukedom at Magenta. Italy is like a naughty handsome boy, and the French parties are like aunts who have scolded and rated the scapegrace for every fresh freak, but who, when they find that he has grown up and really come into his property, vow that they adored him from his cradle, and protest that they were always meaning to give him endless sugarplums, only that circumstances unfortunately checked their liberality.

But although Italy has at present no questions which touch her existence to disturb her, those who undertake to manage her affairs have no slight difficulties to encounter. There are two thorns constantly in their side. There is the question how Italy is to pay her way, and the question how brigandage is to be put down, and on each of these questions there are endless controversies and disagreements. Signor MINGHETTI is now at the head of affairs, and he has just explained his views to his constituents at Legnago. His primary notion is that, as these are the two great questions for Italy, they should occupy the attention of the country until they are satisfactorily disposed of. One thing at a time is the principle of conduct on which he insists. There are many abuses to be reformed, many legislative provisions which are necessary if law and administration are to be what Italy would like to see them. Zealous Italians have their crotchets which they are burning to see Parliament take up, and the PRIME MINISTER does not at all deny that many of these crotchets are very good crotchets in their way. But he asks his countrymen to agree with him that the time for taking them up has not yet come. As in England, when Sir ROBERT PEEL came into office and had to face the deficit caused by Whig financiers, he would not allow any question to be discussed until the balance of the Budget had been satisfactorily restored, so, now that Italy has even a more serious deficit to lament, Signor MINGHETTI wishes that the consideration of all minor reforms should be postponed until Italian finance is put on a sound footing. That this should be done, two things are essential. In the first place, enough money must be raised by taxation to meet those wants of the country which are absolutely indispensable, and for this purpose taxes must be wisely imposed and rigorously collected. On the incidence of some of the most important taxes Parliamentary Committees have already reported, or can be instructed to report, and there is no want of diligence or ability in the reporters. What is needed is that the Italian Parliament and the constituencies should take to heart the lessons which these reports teach, and be resolute in giving them effect. If this were done, Signor MINGHETTI is confident that Italy would show itself indisputably solvent, and that the gigantic evil of a depreciated currency might be successfully attacked. There is no doubt a deficit for the coming financial year which, even if it is reduced as far as the most sanguine calculators think it can be reduced, would nearly reach a million sterling. Before long, however, the expiration of existing Treaties of Commerce will give Italy the opportunity of making new arrangements which, although conceived in the spirit of Free-trade, will be beneficial to her pocket; and if the taxes were better arranged, Italy could probably find another million sterling. But then there is something more wanted. The Budget cannot be balanced if the country is to rush into new expenditure. The position taken up by Signor MINGHETTI is that, if it is proposed to spend a franc more, it must be first

shown where the franc is to come from. The Ministry which preceded that of Signor MINGHETTI fell because the Italian Parliament insisted on voting the expenditure of certain sums on a harbour, although the Government protested that there was no money that could be applied to the purpose. The friends of inconsiderate expenditure have not gained much by opening the door of office to Signor MINGHETTI. He erects into a principle what his predecessors insisted on under special circumstances. He announces that he will not listen to any proposal for new expenditure unless the advocates of this expenditure at the same time express their willingness to vote for some new tax which will supply the requisite funds; and it will very seldom happen that the hope of the popularity to be gained by conferring a local benefit or perpetrating a local job will not be outweighed by the fear of the odium attaching to a proposal to burden still further the distressed taxpayer.

Finance is the first subject that occupies the attention of a prudent Italian Minister, but brigandage is the second, and as life is more valuable than money, it may be almost said to be as important for Italy to put brigandage down as to put her finances in order. Simple brigandage is indeed not a very difficult thing to cope with. If it is only a few ruffians who carry off a traveller to get a ransom paid for him, there is some chance that, as the country becomes better cultivated and the roads more frequented, the ruffians may think it worth their while to go into a quieter line of business. The police, too, may hope to catch the offenders and bring them to justice. An ecclesiastic has just been carried off at no great distance from Rome, and his family could not get him back until they had paid a large ransom. But the police have, it is said, caught the offenders, and it may be expected that this will be a warning to their friends and neighbours. The old Papal administration was so wretchedly bad, and brigands who mixed a little superstition with their passion for crime were so readily tolerated, that it is not wonderful if traces of old customs linger in a district where brigandage a few years ago was recognized as a peculiar but rather pious way of gaining a livelihood. It is when something very different is meant by brigandage that it becomes dangerous—when it is an organized system, a vast conspiracy of one half of society against the other, a machinery of terrorism carried into daily life. Such a state of things is found to some extent at Naples, and on a much larger scale and in a more terrible form in Sicily. For such an evil the remedy must be sharp; and law with its regular processes is inadequate. We again have the honour of supplying a precedent to Italian admirers of our Constitution, and Signor MINGHETTI says that Italians need not be ashamed to have to do in Southern Italy and Sicily what free and enlightened England has had to do in Ireland. The parallel seems to be a perfectly just and right one. English law could not repress agrarian crime in Ireland, because no persons would give information and no jury would convict. The Government was entrusted with the power of sweeping off the persons it considered dangerous and shutting them up in prison, and agrarian crime was effectually repressed. Not long ago the Italian Government determined to use or assume a similar power, and summarily arrested and carried off sixty members of the Camorra of Naples. There is no other way of breaking up such an organization, and the Italian Parliament must make up its mind either to let the Camorra flourish or to sanction such arbitrary steps on the part of the Government. In Sicily things are worse, because the system of organized and associated brigandage prevails over so much larger an extent of country. Up to this time the Government has only tried half-measures, for there is a powerful party which is opposed to any sterner measures being tried, and no doubt there would be a considerable irritation caused in Sicily, which is by no means well disposed to the Italian Kingdom, if the Government were permitted by law to do things in Sicily which in Italy generally would not be tolerated. When in Sicily there are persons whom the police have strong reason to suspect to belong to the associated brigandage, these persons can be summoned and solemnly warned; but this only puts them on their guard. Or, if there is more proof of guilt, they can be sent to a neighbouring district, and not allowed to leave it; but they are very little affected by this, and keep up uninterrupted communications with their old accomplices. What the Ministry will probably ask Parliament for is the power to seize on suspected persons, and send them to a place of confinement

out of the island. This would, it is thought, have real terrors for the brigands, as it would take away the hope of release through a revolution, which robs imprisonment in the island of its terrors, and would debar the prisoners from making the gaol, as they often make it now, a centre where, through those released, and even through the gaolers themselves, new plots for crime are hatched. This is, no doubt, to treat persons not legally convicted in a very arbitrary manner; but it is at least well for a country that it should be governed by men who have the courage to speak plainly, and to let it be understood that, if organized brigandage is to be suppressed, an arbitrary way of dealing with it must be adopted and sanctioned.

POLITICAL THEORISTS.

SOME politicians think of their country and its institutions only as materials for ingenious theories of reconstruction; yet, except that its prospective security is perhaps affected by the license of modern speculation, England in its political and social condition can scarcely be thought urgently to require revolutionary changes. Many political and social imperfections exist; but, in comparison with former times, or with the state of foreign nations, something may be said for the results of absolute freedom and of a complex traditional constitution. One of the most thoughtful and acute of economists and politicians, associated during the greater part of his life with the advocates of reform, has often of late disturbed the complacency of optimists by pointing to the "Rocks Ahead" which he discerns with painful clearness of vision. Mr. GREG doubts whether the historical continuity of political improvement may not be violently interrupted through the supremacy of the multitude; and he apprehends that the industrial supremacy of England may be impaired and gradually destroyed through the unavoidable exhaustion of coal. CASSANDRA, to whom Mr. GREG often compares himself, was an instructive if not a cheerful prophetess; yet the chief drawback to the utility of her warnings was, not that they were neglected by her hearers, but that the doom which she foretold was irrevocably predetermined in the councils of the Gods. It is difficult to escape from Mr. GREG's melancholy conclusions, for household suffrage cannot be abolished, and it will probably be extended; and it is even more impossible to create fresh fuel than to re-establish bulwarks against democracy. The political student might almost be excused for any sophistical evasion by which he might endeavour to escape from Mr. GREG's gloomy vaticinations. Unfortunately he finds himself compelled to admit that he is dealing with a logical reasoner who is furnished with an inexhaustible provision of accurate statistics. The office of foreboding evil has been discharged by more authentic prophets than CASSANDRA. The Assyrian conquest was announced again and again by JEREMIAH as an inevitable calamity which could only be alleviated by submission. Entertaining the convictions which he has unwillingly and deliberately adopted, Mr. GREG performs a public duty by calling attention to dangers which may perhaps be averted or delayed by timely precautions. It may be conjectured that, if he had the power of regulating the course of events, he would prefer existing imperfections to the risks of the unknown future.

A theorist of a different class has lately broached with unhesitating confidence political opinions which are not equally entitled to serious consideration. Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL has in the course of active official life done so much good service that it almost seems harsh to object to his crude and confident proposals; yet he would scarcely accept as a becoming reward for his services unlimited liberty to indulge in irresponsible talk. Some excuse for his hasty suggestions may be found in the sudden discontinuance of the arduous administrative labours of his previous life. A wheel which goes on revolving without purpose after it has been disconnected from the motive power and from dependent machinery will in time probably itself attain a state of rest. The desire of new employment is in such a case intelligible and even laudable; and Sir G. CAMPBELL's energy may be turned to practical use if he succeeds in finding a seat in the House of Commons. In the meantime he is apparently compelled to solace himself with social science, which offers many temptations to unemployed mental activity. Sir G. CAMPBELL surprised the Social Section of the British

Association by the proposition that there was no such thing as property in land; and at the Social Science Association he calmly announced the expediency of abolishing all academical endowments, and he informed his audience that those classical and mathematical studies which have been pursued for many generations by the English Universities are only cultivated under the influence of unreasoning superstition. If Sir G. CAMPBELL has profoundly studied the theory of the higher education, his single-minded devotion to his public duties must have been greatly exaggerated by popular repute. His lucubrations on trade and political economy perhaps deserved more attention, because he has had large practical experience of the wants and resources of a numerous community. It is now generally agreed that in his controversy with Lord NORTHBROOK Sir G. CAMPBELL was in the wrong; but nevertheless his judgment on questions of Indian administration is entitled to respectful consideration. If an English schoolmaster should undertake to correct Sir G. CAMPBELL's erroneous notions as to the government of Bengal, his suggestions would be neither more nor less valuable than Sir G. CAMPBELL's condemnation of the study of Latin and Greek and mathematics. Scholars and men of science form so small a minority in any mixed assembly, that an attack on systematic study and solid learning usually produces applause. Yet Sir G. CAMPBELL's denunciation of endowments seemed to be unanimously disapproved even by an audience accustomed to the vagaries of social science. It seemed not to have occurred to Sir G. CAMPBELL that the question was probably not altogether new, and that general opinion had not been passively waiting for the arrival of a philosopher from India, wholly unaffected by English prejudices. When young men begin to think on important subjects, their rapid discoveries and positive conclusions are regarded by maturer minds with a feeling of tolerant amusement. A vigorous intellect released in middle age from absorbing occupation naturally exhibits the peculiarities, if not the presumption, of youth.

Sir G. CAMPBELL repeated to the Social Science Association in a different form his fantastical application to English land of Indian systems of tenure. Antiquaries and historical jurists have of late years thrown much light on primitive forms of landed property, and on the various conditions under which it exists in many parts of the world. It is well known that previous writers had too commonly assumed that the English distribution of the ownership and occupation of land was universal, if not necessary; and probably there are still English landlords who have never doubted that they and their tenants and the labourers on their estates form the indispensable elements of an immutable society. Sir G. CAMPBELL was at liberty, if he thought it worth while, to confirm by his authority the familiar statement that land tenure is not the same in Bengal as in England, though his preference for the system which may suit a simpler and more primitive community might probably be mistaken. Experience has nothing to do with the sweeping doctrine that no property in land can have a rightful or natural existence. It seems probable that an institution which has existed for centuries in England and throughout civilized Europe may at least be intelligible, and perhaps even defensible. If Sir G. CAMPBELL had taken more time to think and to learn before he commenced his course of dogmatic teaching, he might perhaps have discovered that all rights of property are ideal and conventional in the same sense with the dominion of land. The right of the possessor of a shilling to command a shilling's worth of commodities or of personal service is in all respects analogous to the right of a landlord to receive rent for the use of his fields by a tenant. If a system of Communism is ever practically established in England or in any part of Europe, it will probably have been gradually introduced by the preliminary confiscation of the property of landowners. Mortgagees will necessarily be submitted to the same process of expropriation, and then the question will immediately arise why other public and private creditors should have an advantage over those who have invested in landed security. It will be impossible to stop short even with the adoption of M. LOUIS BLANC's formula, that all persons shall receive from the State or other universal distributor according to their needs. Consistent levellers will easily prove that no man has a right to need more than another; and ultimately a vast community compelled to work by military discipline will be maintained, if it is maintained at

all, on uniform rations. A system of society modelled, except that it would have no external aid, on that of Bengal during a famine would scarcely approve itself to Sir G. CAMPBELL's judgment. He would probably dispute the inferences which are drawn by his critics from his partial and hasty judgments. It is only by way of illustration that it becomes expedient to comment on his sudden conclusions. In political controversy some things must be taken for granted, nor is it desirable incessantly to take the social machine to pieces for the purpose of seeing how it is made. The English nation is happily by no means ready to accept novel theories from unsophisticated Anglo-Indian instructors. The traders of Bradford, who are probably not profound Greek scholars, lately voted by an overwhelming majority that Greek should be taught in the grammar school where their sons are educated. Sir G. CAMPBELL's simple-minded belief that whatever is wrong would not have commended itself to the obtuse minds of Yorkshire manufacturers.

THE DUKE OF PADUA AND MARSHAL MACMAHON.

SUCH attention as French politicians have been able to spare during the last week from the Spanish Note and the recall of the *Orénoque* has been claimed and merited by the Duke of PADUA. When the Government came to study this gentleman's address to the electors, it seems to have occurred to them that to favour his return would be tantamount to accepting his reading of the events which the Septennate is to usher in. Perhaps if the DUKE had restricted himself to the expression of his hope that NAPOLEON IV. would then be placed on the throne, the Government might have condoned this, as they have condoned a good many other Imperialist sentiments. But he went on to say that the best means of preparing the way for this blessed result would be to return Imperialist deputies and thus to create in the Assembly itself a majority of the right sort. If after this the Government had given him any active countenance, they would have been asked whether they took the same view as the Duke of PADUA as to the result of electing Imperialists; and in this respect common sense is so entirely on the DUKE's side that no amount of Ministerial denials would have persuaded people to the contrary. Under these circumstances the Cabinet decided to remain neutral, but they have found to their cost that it is almost as true of neutrality as of a quarrel, that it takes two to make it. If so, the Duke of PADUA was resolved that he would not be one of the two. With admirable boldness he wrote to all the Mayors in the department asking them for their kind assistance in promoting his return, and grounding his request on the fact that in a recent interview Marshal MACMAHON had authorized him to declare that the Government wished to maintain the strictest neutrality in the contest in Seine and Oise. This was more than the Ministry could stand, and at the risk of alienating the Bonapartists altogether, the *Français* was instructed to say that, in presenting the MARSHAL to the electors in the character of a sympathizer with the Imperialist candidate, and in giving a political meaning to a conversation which was only an interchange of the ordinary social courtesies, the Duke of PADUA had been guilty of an unworthy manoeuvre. Lest this disavowal should not make a sufficient impression on the Mayors, the Prefect was directed to send them a formal Circular reminding them that in the department of Seine and Oise he alone had the right to speak to them in the name of the Government, and warning them that the neutrality which the Government wished to enforce on them was a different neutrality from that contemplated by the Duke of PADUA. The DUKE had assumed that by refraining from taking any part in the election the Government had left its subordinates free, even in their official capacity, to take what part they liked. The Prefect pointed out that what the Government meant to convey was that its subordinates in their official capacity should support neither candidate. The Duke of PADUA replied to this Circular by another letter addressed to the Mayors. Considering the relations which exist in France between the Prefect and the Government, and the extreme improbability that the Prefect would have written in such terms if he had not been acting under orders, the DUKE's second letter is a masterpiece. The Prefect's Circular, he says, is nothing else than a breach of the neutrality pro-

claimed by Marshal MACMAHON. In saying that he alone has the right of giving expression to the views of the Government, the Prefect deceives himself. Above Prefects and Ministers alike there is the Chief of the State. "I have made you acquainted with the language used to me by Marshal MACMAHON, and I reassert in the most absolute manner all that I have said of it. The Circular will not, I am sure, have the effect which the Prefect and the Republican candidate may expect it to have."

At this point the patience of the Government gave way. To see their own Prefect put aside and told that he did not know his business, to see the Mayors cautioned not to pay any attention to him but to take their instructions from the Duke of PADUA, was too much for the most Bonapartist member of the Cabinet. On Wednesday a Council of Ministers was held, and the Duke of PADUA was dismissed from his place among the Mayors. The commune of Courson L'Aulnay knows him no more. Even now, however, the DUKE was not silenced. This time he writes direct to Marshal MACMAHON, and makes it very clear that though the Chief of the State may be above Prefects and Ministers, he is not, in the Duke of PADUA's estimation, above the Duke of PADUA. At another time, he says, he should have allowed the Ministerial decree to pass with silent indifference, but under existing circumstances he is compelled to notice it. It may be that, in dismissing him from his post, the MARSHAL intends to disclaim the language he attributed to him in their recent interview. In that case the DUKE feels it his duty to affirm once more the absolute exactness of his version of it, and he believes that nobody will doubt his word. This is really an extremely clever line to take. It seems to place the MARSHAL and the Duke of PADUA in opposition as to what took place at an interview at which only they were present. Upon this point the DUKE's memory may be as accurate as the MARSHAL's; indeed, as the MARSHAL has political reasons for disavowing the DUKE's interpretation, it is likely to be even more accurate. The Duke of PADUA evidently calculates that the readers of his letter to Marshal MACMAHON will not be at the trouble of referring to his original letter to the Mayors. If they do refer to it, they will of course see that it is not the account given by the DUKE of the MARSHAL's words which the Government has disavowed, but the inference as to the liberty allowed to the Mayors which the DUKE chose to draw from those words. Marshal MACMAHON told the Duke of PADUA that his Government would maintain a sincere neutrality between him and M. SENARD, and this statement has never been challenged. It was only when the DUKE went on to argue that this declaration of neutrality on the part of the Government was tantamount to full permission to the Mayors to constitute themselves partisans that the Government interfered.

Whatever influence this correspondence may exercise on the particular election to which it relates, the Duke of PADUA may cheer himself by the reflection that he has caused the Government a great deal more annoyance than they have caused him. He has compelled them to come to an open quarrel with an Imperialist leader, and by this means to run the risk of alienating Imperialist support in any department—if there still be such a department—in which a candidate declares himself as a supporter of the Septennate pure and simple. Even the *Journal de Paris*, hitherto the most ardent advocate of the coalition with the Bonapartists, has been compelled to change its tone, and now writes with edifying gravity of the Empire as the cause of all the misfortunes under which France has lately suffered—of the unity of Italy, of the expedition to Mexico, of the aggrandizement of Prussia, and a hundred other services of the same kind. Ministerialists who take this tone must be supposed to have counted the cost, and it must be admitted that the attitude of the Duke of PADUA made it very difficult for them to take any other. But the cost may possibly be greater than they expect. If the Imperialists had no passions, they would still support the personal Septennate, no matter what insults they might have to endure from its partisans. The longer France can be kept without a settled Government the better will be the chances of Imperialism, and if the Bonapartists can but bear this in mind, they will persist in turning the other cheek. But the Duke of PADUA's letter to Marshal MACMAHON seems to show that there is a limit beyond which even the humility dictated by interest cannot go. The shrewdest politicians are not free from bursts of anger, and it is far

from unlikely that under the influence of one of these the Imperialists may not only withdraw their support from Ministerial candidates in elections, if any such should present themselves, but what is more serious, decline to vote with Ministers in the Assembly. In that event it is not very evident how the Government will make good their defection. If they lose the Bonapartists, they must appeal either to the Legitimists or to the Conservative Republicans, to the Extreme Right, or to the Left Centre. Their chance of winning back the former seems smaller than ever. The Duke DECAZES has already given them grave offence in recalling the *Orénoque*, and he may have to give them further offence by withdrawing the officials who are accused of showing Carlist sympathies on the Pyrenean frontier. An alliance with the Left Centre is always to be had, but it can be had only on one condition—the recognition of the Republic. The care which M. DUBAURE has lately taken to identify the Government of Marshal MACMAHON with that of M. THIERS shows that he has not yet given up the hope of seeing the Republic frankly accepted by Marshal MACMAHON, and the state of utter friendliness in which the Government is likely to stand at the opening of the Session will make it a matter of the utmost moment to them to construct a majority of some kind. But an alliance with the Republicans will be a very bitter pill for the Orleanists to swallow, and there have lately been some indications of an intention on their part to desert Marshal MACMAHON if he should desert the Conservative party by taking the Left Centre into his counsels. The MARSHAL would then have to choose between governing with a majority from which the party who had placed him in power was altogether excluded, and governing with no majority at all. Either of these expedients would be exceedingly distasteful to him, and we do not know that there are any data from which to conclude which of the two evils he would think the less. The Duke of PADUA may not have done the best for his party in forcing the Government to disown him so publicly, but he may enjoy to the full the pleasures which flow from gratified spite.

THE LONDON GAS COMPANIES.

THE Metropolitan Board of Works and the Corporation of the City of London have determined to apply in the next Session of Parliament for powers to supply gas within their respective districts. The Bills to be introduced will probably contain provisions for the construction of new works for the manufacture and distribution of gas; but, if the promoters are in earnest, their real object will be more reasonable and more defensible than the absurd project of doubling the expenditure already incurred in the provision of a necessary of life. The real question for Parliament to consider will be the future ownership of the existing works, and not the waste of an enormous sum and the sacrifice of valuable space in the erection of new gas-works. The inhabitants of London, even where they are indifferent to the spoliation of joint-stock property, would scarcely desire that every street in the metropolis should be disturbed by laying down a second set of mains for the purpose of rendering the existing distributive apparatus useless. That this is the scheme ostensibly recommended by certain members of the Board of Works and the Corporation is only an additional illustration of the national tendency to conduct business by the machinery of fiction. In applying for power to construct works the municipal bodies aim at a compulsory purchase, which they hope to effect on inequitable terms by the aid of a formidable menace. Eight years ago an attempt to confiscate a part of the property of the Gas Companies was universally condemned; nor has Parliament in a single instance allowed Corporations to purchase gas-works against the will of their owners, even at their full value. The alternative power of establishing a subsidized competition which it would be impossible to resist has never been seriously claimed before a Committee. Gas consumers have but a small and doubtful interest in the transfer of the supply of gas from Joint-Stock Companies to representative bodies. If the works are bought at a fair price, gas can neither be made cheaper nor better by a Corporation than by a Company; and the prospective reduction of price or improvement of quality as the consumption extends is an advantage common to both methods of supply. In Manchester and some other towns the Corporation raises an income from the profits of supply, for the benefit of the general community. If the supply

were in the hands of the Company, the surplus would under the general law be applied to the reduction of price.

The recent agitation has been caused by the rise in the price of gas which was sanctioned some months since by Commissioners appointed by the Board of Trade in consequence of the great increase in the cost of manufacture. One of the Companies which were authorized to add a percentage to their charge has already returned to its former rates; but the majority of the Board of Works is not inclined to let slip an occasion of increasing its powers. The authority of the Board of Trade and of their Commissioners was, in the case of the Imperial Gas Company, conferred by an Act passed in 1869. The Commissioners are empowered "to fix such an illuminating power and such a price as shall be calculated to yield the Company with due care and management (after allowing for the excess or surplus, if any, carried in the then last preceding year to the credit of the divisible profit and to the Reserved Fund of the Company) a dividend attaining as near as may be, but in no case exceeding, the rate of dividend to which the respective capitals of the Company are entitled under this Act and the existing Acts of the Company, and to make up the Reserved Fund and the Contingency Fund of the Company." The Commissioners are in no case to fix the illuminating power lower, or the price higher, than the maximum and minimum respectively fixed by the Act of 1860; and, subject to the foregoing provision, they are to fix the power as high and the price as low as circumstances will permit. After full inquiry the Commissioners, consisting of an eminent lawyer, a chemist of the highest rank, and an experienced actuary, sanctioned the price and power which the Board of Works, who had opposed the demand of the Companies, now resent by the introduction of their Bill. The authorized dividend was ten per cent. on a portion of the capital, and seven per cent. on that which has been recently raised. The present shareholders have of course for the most part purchased their stock at the market rates on the faith of the existing Acts. The dividend of ten per cent. on the capital of Gas Companies was allowed by the public Gas Clauses Bill of 1846; but of late years Committees of Parliament have habitually limited the dividend on newly authorized capital to seven per cent. It was for the protection both of proprietors and consumers that the Imperial Gas Act of 1869, and similar Acts affecting other London Gas Companies, were passed. If, after the legislation of 1860 and 1869, all the owners of gas shares should be suddenly deprived of their property without compensation, the security of personal and of real estate would be gravely impaired.

A member of the Metropolitan Board complained at a recent meeting that, in the absence of municipal institutions for London, the Board had not even power to supply the population with gas. As the same disability attaches in similar circumstances to every Corporation in the kingdom, it would have been strange that a Board created for certain specific and limited purposes should possess unprecedented powers. The dissatisfied representative of a Vestry might have been expected to remember that the City Corporation has as little power to supply gas as the Board of Works. In several instances Gas Companies promoting Bills for additional powers have been met by Corporations with Bills for compulsory purchase, or, as an alternative, for the construction of competitive works. The result has often been a compromise in the form of a purchase; and Committees have always required that the full value of the property of the Companies should be paid, as an indispensable condition of the transfer. The only case in which a Bill for compulsory purchase has been independently promoted was that of the Sheffield Corporation five or six years ago. In that case the promoters offered the full value of the property of the Company; but, as they failed to prove any mismanagement, the Committee threw out the Bill without calling on the opponents. In the last Session the Nottingham Gas Company promoted a Bill for raising additional capital, and the Corporation in turn promoted a Bill for purchase. Before the case was heard the Company agreed to sell their property for a considerable bonus in addition to its market value. An exactly similar contest between the Nottingham Corporation and the Water Company ended, in default of agreement, in the rejection of the Bill for compulsory purchase. The London Corporation and the Metropolitan Board of Works will be unable to adduce a single precedent even for compulsory purchase at the full value of the shares. Their proposal to establish competitive works

is too obviously inexpedient to be adopted, even if it were not flagrantly unjust. It may be assumed that the Corporation and the Board of Works will be unable to prove any case of mismanagement or neglect. The gas referees appointed under the Gas Acts are responsible for the quality of the gas supplied, which might undoubtedly be improved if the consumers were willing to incur the requisite expense. No Committee to which the Bills may be referred is likely to override in substance the decision of the highly competent Commissioners who lately considered the cases of the Chartered Gas Company and the Imperial Company.

Although Parliament has hitherto declined to enforce the transfer of gas and water undertakings from Companies to public bodies, it may be doubted whether it has not committed an error, though on the right side. It is much more important that property should be protected than that Corporations should have the satisfaction of controlling the supply of gas and water; but shareholders, while they are entitled to the full income derived from their capital, have no further claim or interest. A landowner has a sentimental attachment to his fields; but a recipient of ten per cent. on a given sum has no preference for one solvent paymaster over another. If a Corporation consents to pay the annual income, giving sufficient security, the ratepayers may perhaps be pleased, and the gas and water shareholders are in no way hurt. In theory the consumers or their representatives ought to be the nominal owners of the surplus profits to which they are already entitled. The Gas Clauses and Water Clauses Acts of 1846 virtually effected the change of ownership which would be formally accomplished by a transfer. All Gas Companies, after paying their authorized dividends, and providing any reserve allowed by their special Acts, must apply their surplus profits to a reduction of rates. In other words, the consumers are the residuary proprietors, and the shareholders, as long as they earn their maximum dividend, are merely annuitants or mortgagees, and trustees of the surplus. It is consistent with principle that the beneficial owners should administer the estate, inasmuch as the shareholders have no motive for improving the property after their own incomes are fully secured. The holder of 1,000*l.* in the stock of one of the London Gas Companies is entitled either to 100*l.*, or, as the case may be, to 70*l.* a year. The Acts provide that the price may be increased to the point at which his dividend can be earned. He is also entitled to the benefit of a further payment towards a limited reserve or insurance fund. If there are any other prospective advantages, they would be taken into account in settling the terms of a purchase; but, when all the claims of justice are satisfied, Parliament would be justified in establishing, although for the first time, the principle of compulsory transfer. If the Board of Works or the Corporation were to reject equitable terms, their refusal to purchase would involve an acknowledgment that the works could not be more economically or advantageously conducted than at present. It is impossible that any Parliamentary Committee should allow public bodies at a great and wasteful cost to undersell and ruin undertakings which they refuse to purchase.

WIFE MURDER.

IT is satisfactory to find that the HOME SECRETARY has had sufficient firmness to resist the solicitations addressed to him on behalf of the murderer COPPEN, and that the law has been allowed to take its course. COPPEN, we are glad to see, was hanged on Tuesday. We are glad of this, not of course from any unchristian feeling towards COPPEN, but because we trust his death may, if the same course is persistently followed in other cases, be the means of saving the lives of a great many COPPENS, and particularly the lives of their wives. It is obvious that the effect of the criminal law as a deterring influence must necessarily depend upon the degree of certainty with which its threatened punishments are actually inflicted. In proportion to the chances of escape there will be a tendency to reckon on them, and when, in other cases, the law is carried out, it will be apt to have the appearance of injustice or caprice. There was unfortunately nothing novel or peculiar in the circumstances of the murder which COPPEN committed. It was only one of those too familiar cases of the murder of a wife by a drunken husband which continue to occur with increasing frequency, and which, indeed, are becoming

so common that they scarcely attract attention. If a man happens in a moment of exhilaration to beat his wife about the head with a poker, or to dance all over her with iron-shod clogs, the magistrates can hardly bring themselves to give him more than a few weeks' imprisonment; and if the woman dies abundant reasons are instantly suggested why her death should be regarded as a trivial kind of accidental manslaughter. In these days of expansive philanthropy it is perhaps not going too far to express a hope that in future the wives of working-men may be murdered less frequently, and that working-men, even if they do not care for their wives' lives, will show some regard for their own, and avoid sharing the fate of COPPEN by refraining as far as possible from imitating his example. The object of hanging COPPEN was of course not to take a poor revenge on the wretched man himself, but to warn others who might be tempted to commit the same crime—or, as it is styled in the euphemism of his friends and sympathizers, error—that they had better not. We gather, however, from the speeches which were made at a meeting of working-men on Saturday last at Camberwell, where COPPEN lived, that there is an opinion that greater indulgence should be shown to persons, especially if they belong to the operative class, who kill their wives. Several speakers urged in extenuation of the crime that it was committed in a moment of passion, and that the murderer had been provoked to do it by words from his wife; and the general tone of the meeting seems to have favoured the theory that a nagging wife must lay her account to be murdered if her husband happens to get drunk or lose his temper. One speaker, Mr. STUBBS, even went so far as to say that every one present was as liable as COPPEN to commit a crime of this kind in a moment of uncontrollable passion. We can only say that we trust that, if Mr. STUBBS should at any time unfortunately yield to that taste for homicide which he assumes to be a common feature of human nature, at least in his own class of life, Mr. CROSS will be then at the Home Office.

It is impossible to shut our eyes to the evidence which meets us at every turn that at the present moment a considerable part of the population of this country is suffering from a sort of epidemic of violence and brutality; and it is to be feared that the origin of this disorder may in a large degree be traced to the morbid tenderness and delicacy with which such crimes are too often treated. It would be absurd to suppose that the execution of COPPEN will encourage Mr. STUBBS or any other gentleman of similar proclivities to murder his wife; but if COPPEN had been reprieved, it might have had a different effect. This is a very good example of the sort of cases in which a question is raised as to the premeditation of a murder. It was shown that COPPEN was not in the habit of treating his wife unkindly, but he had for some time fallen into intemperate habits. On the night before the murder he had been drinking, and when his wife remonstrated with him, he went out for more liquor. It does not exactly appear how he spent the night, but probably he was drinking or sleeping off his debauch. His wife did not see him again till next morning. He was then in the shop, and as she passed through he rushed at her, and, without a word, stabbed her with a long pork-butcher's knife which he had in his hand. Whether the woman had first spoken to him is not known. Before she died she said that she was sorry for her husband, that she had "aggravated" him, and that she hoped he would not be punished. COPPEN, in the statement which he made just before his execution, said that he did not know what occurred before he stabbed his wife. It is possible that she may have spoken sharply to him, but the probability is that it was her love and pity for the man that made her afterwards try to shield him from punishment by suggesting that she had given him provocation. In any case, if there was provocation at all, it could only have been a passing word, as she seems to have been attacked almost as soon as she appeared. It should be observed that COPPEN had that morning borrowed the knife with which he committed the murder from a neighbouring butcher, saying he wanted it to cut bread and batter, and asked to have it "touched up for him"—that is, sharpened. It is unnecessary to suppose that he procured the knife with a deliberate intention to use it upon his wife. He had been drinking heavily, and had possibly been brooding over his wife's reproaches. There can be little doubt that it was not a cold and plotted murder, but that he stabbed his wife because he had maddened himself with drink. Baron

BRAMWELL, who tried the case, impressed upon the jury very strongly that if a man, without lawful cause, and without circumstances to reduce the act to manslaughter, inflicted a deadly wound on another of which that person died, he was guilty of murder, although the thought of doing it never entered his mind until the moment he gave the fatal blow. He added that he told the jury that without a particle of doubt, and that he was as sure of it as of any proposition of law ever laid down. The question is, in fact, whether there is at the moment of killing an intention to kill, or to inflict an injury which may be reasonably expected to result in death. Under these circumstances the jury had no alternative but to find the prisoner guilty of murder, but they were weak enough to add a recommendation to mercy. The HOME SECRETARY has, however, taken the more correct view that those who are most in want of mercy are the wives of men like COPPEN.

It is too often overlooked that the object of capital punishment is to preserve life; and there would no doubt be a general desire to put an end to such punishments if *messieurs les assassins* would only begin. In the present instance it is impossible to say how far the crime was premeditated; but the depth of the wound—six inches, through stays and clothes—shows that the thrust must at the moment when it was made have been intended to do serious harm; and it is as well that experiments of this kind should be discouraged. It appears to have been in the minds of some of the working-men at Camberwell that, if a man is to be hanged for killing his wife in a fit of drunkenness, this is an interference with the liberty of drinking. From this point of view drunkenness is regarded as a sort of certificate entitling the bearer to commit murder with impunity. It would be satisfactory to find that serious reflection on the possible consequences of getting drunk had the effect of promoting sobriety. One of the chief arguments at the meeting at Camberwell was that "mercy had been shown to others 'who had committed' what is called 'rash deeds' similar to that for which COPPEN was condemned. One speaker remarked that, 'if the law were always strictly 'carried out, it would be ridiculous to attempt to save 'COPPEN.' The meaning of this is of course that, as other murderers had been got off, COPPEN might as well be got off too. There can be no doubt that reprieves have been granted in other cases on insufficient grounds, and the consequence has been an impression that capital punishment for murder was going to be gradually abolished. A year or two since a clergyman at Brixton murdered his wife with great deliberation and under circumstances of peculiar atrocity, and his life was spared for no other reason than that he was a respectable person. It is such cases as this which confuse and weaken the public sense of the gravity of crime, and show the necessity of treating it with uniform and unflinching stringency.

THE POLICY OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

READERS of the Report of the Local Government Board for 1873 and of Mr. SIMON'S Report for the same year may have noticed some traces of disagreement, at all events in theory, between the Board and its Medical Officer. The medical journals enable us to fix more exactly upon the point on which the two authorities are at variance. Shortly stated, it comes to this, that the Board are of opinion that the additional work thrown on the department by the Public Health Acts should be done by the ordinary Inspectors, while Mr. SIMON is of opinion that the supervision and suggestion of sanitary reforms should be exclusively entrusted to Medical Inspectors. The arguments relied on by the advocates of the latter course are sufficiently obvious. The prevention of disease is at least as important a work as the cure of it; and if we do not think of putting laymen to do the one, why should we put them to do the other? The business of the Inspector is to bring the conclusions of sanitary science to bear on the facts which he finds existing in his district, and he will do this with far greater success if he is himself experimentally acquainted with these conclusions, or has perhaps assisted in establishing them, than if he merely accepts them at second-hand. This reasoning leaves out of sight two very important considerations. The first is that, though the importance of preventing disease is as

great as that of curing it, the difficulty of preventing it is very much less. The cure of actual disease is the highest achievement of the medical art. The prevention of disease is really little more than a matter of common sense. A layman will be helpless in the presence of typhoid fever, but he may know as well as the doctor that the pollution of drinking water by sewage is the ordinary cause of typhoid, and an examination of the relative positions of the well and the cesspool will tell whether such communication is likely to exist in a particular case. An investigation of this kind is not specially doctor's work; it is as much a matter for the civil engineer, or for any one who can use a two-foot rule, can ascertain the fall of the ground, and can find out whether the soil is porous or retentive. No doubt it is essential that the Inspector should be able, if necessary, to check his conclusions by reference to an expert. An analysis of the water contained in the well may disclose the presence of sewage, and this fact is valuable both as satisfying the Inspector that he drew the right inference from the proximity of the well and the cesspool, and also as putting the case in a more convincing and serviceable form. But the necessity of having medical experts to refer to does not involve the necessity of having every Inspector a medical expert, and there is no reason why the choice of the department should be restricted to members of a single profession when the technical training peculiar to that profession is not universally required.

The second consideration left out of sight by what, for convenience sake, may be called the medical party is of still greater weight. The work of the Local Government Board is hardly ever a work of first instance. When the central authorities have made up their minds that such or such sanitary measures ought to be undertaken in such or such a district, they have not got simply to give the order and set the work in train. The real obstacles to sanitary progress have still to be overcome; the local authorities have to be convinced that the measures in question are really necessary. It is with these local authorities that the initiative rests, for the very simple reason that it is by the ratepayers whom they represent that the cost of the work will have to be borne. The Local Government Board have the power, in the last resort, of superseding the local authorities, but it is evident that, if this power were often resorted to, the unpopularity of the central authorities would be so great as to constitute a grave additional difficulty in the way of amendment. It is of extreme importance, therefore, that the suggestions made to the local authorities by the Inspectors should be put forward in such a way as to excite as little opposition as possible. The success of the work will greatly depend on the temper in which it is taken up, and what this temper is will often be greatly determined by the action of the Inspector. It is not meant of course that a medical Inspector may not be in all respects as judicious as a lay Inspector. But the medical Inspector would have a prejudice to get over which does not exist in the case of a lay Inspector. The local authorities suspect a doctor, and the more ignorant and difficult they are to deal with the stronger will be the hold of this suspicion on their minds. They will fancy that the doctor recommends these changes because he must be recommending something. They will look upon the proposed improvements as so much doctor's stuff, which the patient has to take, not to benefit himself, but to swell the doctor's bill. There are few things that Englishmen dislike more than the thought of being delivered over to a professional class, whether it be medical, legal, or clerical. There is a latent disbelief in the value of sanitary measures, which it would not take much to rouse into active life, and nothing would be so likely to have this effect as to treat the expenditure of the whole country on sanitary reforms as a matter to be decided by a few doctors.

Even if it were necessary that the work of inspection should in all cases be done by doctors, it would be advisable to communicate with the local authorities through laymen; and when, as happens to be the case here, there is no need for anything of the sort, to make doctors Inspectors would be wantonly to throw obstacles in the way of sanitary administration. The circumstance that a suggestion has, so to speak, been filtered through the brain of a layman will often dispose a local authority to accept or at all events to consider it, when, if it had come straight from a medical expert, it would have been dismissed without ceremony. This is not an advantage to be despised, and when, as in the present case, it can be secured without sacrificing any of the real essentials

of sanitary progress, it would have been exceedingly foolish of the Local Government Board to forego it. No doubt there are special subjects of inquiry which properly come under the cognizance of the medical officers of the department, just as there are others which properly come under the cognizance of its engineering officers. Mr. SIMON'S Report for 1873 gives an abstract of forty-two such inquiries conducted during that year. The ground for all these inquiries had been an actual outbreak of disease or an unusually high rate of mortality. Here plainly a doctor was the proper person to apply to. But when once the prevalence of disease has been traced to its origin, the exclusive function of the medical expert is at end. In almost all these instances the seat of the mischief lay in the water supply, and the point for the Local Government Board to consider was what steps ought to be recommended to the local authorities to provide the inhabitants with something that they can drink without risk of being poisoned. The questions which present themselves in connexion with this inquiry will be mainly of a financial character. Pure water can always be had if people choose to pay for it, though there may be cases in which it would cost less to remove the entire population of a village than to bring pure water within their reach. To ascertain from what source water can be obtained, and at what outlay, to advise on the respective merits of the different plans proposed, to press upon the local authorities the need of doing something and the superior economy of doing something that shall be really effectual—these are the duties of an Inspector when once the outbreak has been traced to its cause, and there is not one of these which cannot be as well performed by a layman as by a doctor.

The mention of these inquiries reminds us of one very serious omission in the Report of the Local Government Board for 1873. The Report of the previous year contained a similar summary of eighty-one inquiries instituted during 1872. We called attention at the time to the extraordinary sanitary conditions which these Reports disclosed, and we added that the corresponding tabular statement which would appear in the Report of 1873 ought to contain another column, giving the action of the central authority in all cases in which the local authority had failed in its duty. Unfortunately, no such column has been added to the present Report; and, what is even more to be regretted, nothing is said as to what has been done in the cases reported on in 1872. It follows, therefore, that during those two years something like one hundred and twenty places were discovered in which the inhabitants had no choice but to drink sewage, and of no one of these hundred and twenty places are we told that any measures have been taken to give them something to drink which is not sewage. We do not doubt that in some, perhaps in many, the authorities have bestirred themselves to put an end to this filthy and dangerous state of things. But it is extremely improbable that none of these authorities have been in default, and it is very desirable that the public should know which and how many of them have failed to carry out the orders of the Local Government Board, and what has been done to protect the inhabitants against preventable disease where these orders have not been carried out. It is of the greatest moment to the Local Government Board that it should be supported by a strong and intelligent public opinion, and the first requisite to the creation of this opinion is an accurate knowledge of facts. When eighty-one cases in which whole villages are condemned to drink sewage are enumerated in an official Report, and the next Report comes out and makes no mention of what has been done to relieve them, the charitable supposition would be that the local authorities have done all that was required of them, and that the central department took this as too much a matter of course to deserve mention. If this is the explanation, it is only fair to the local authorities that it should be published. If the charity which hopeth all things has in this instance been greatly deceived, it is equally desirable on other grounds that the shortcomings of the local authorities should not be concealed.

CLERICAL AMUSEMENTS.

THE recent correspondence between the Bishop of Lincoln and the owner of Apology produces a rather mixed feeling. We do not doubt indeed that the Bishop was in the right. As a

general principle, the clergy will not strengthen the position of the Church by becoming owners of race-horses. And if the culprit had been half a century younger, we should have felt not only approval, but sympathy, for the episcopal action. Perhaps the plea of age ought to make no legal difference. Offenders are often pardoned on the ground of tender years; but the indulgence due to old age is not generally understood to mean license for breaking the law. As a matter of fact, however, it necessarily alters our feelings. We cannot be hard upon an old man for preserving some of the prejudices of his youth. Horseracing was never a distinctly clerical amusement; but at least it may be said that in Mr. King's youth the corruptions which are now threatening to drive respectable men from the sport were by no means so flagrant as they are now. Moreover, it is impossible not to feel a sneaking admiration for an old man who retains his sporting enthusiasm. Rightly or wrongly, it seems to imply a kind of masculine vigour which is a good quality even in a clergyman. Whether or not Mr. King is a model priest, we feel that in all probability he is a fine specimen of the English breed; we cannot help in our hearts applauding the old gentleman's pluck, just as we used to admire Lord Palmerston for similar qualities; and it is not quite plain at first sight why a character which may be estimable in the ruler of a country should be altogether inadmissible in the pastor of a parish.

This, indeed, is the most interesting question suggested by the recent discussion. Considering Mr. King's age, he cannot be a scandal to his Bishop for very long, even if he should provide another puzzle for Mr. Thom. Nor is it probable that his example will be imitated by his younger brethren. The very last charge which is likely to be brought against the clergy is that they are given to keep race-horses. But the scandal caused by Mr. King suggests some rather curious questions as to the disqualifications imposed by the clerical character. The rule in all such matters is indefinite enough, and is fixed rather by tradition and by custom than by logical considerations. A clergyman may indulge in most athletic sports; he may play cricket or break his neck in the Alps; fishing is almost a Christian virtue; and, according to Mr. Trollope, no amusement is better suited to the clergy than hunting. Here, however, we come upon debateable ground, and probably the prejudice against a hunting parson is rather growing in strength than otherwise. The objection to hunting, so far as it has any reasonable ground, rests upon the presumption that the amusement costs too much time and money to be compatible with active devotion to a profession; and so far it does not specially affect the clergy. A young barrister or doctor who followed the hounds when he ought to be sitting in court or attending at a hospital would soon find his prospects injured; and the same remark applies in a much stronger degree to the Turf. A clergyman who has a sufficient margin of time and money to be able to attend to horse-racing must be a very exceptional member of his profession.

This purely utilitarian argument, however, is manifestly insufficient to account for the sentiment. The incongruity between the clerical character and the Turf is not really produced by the difficulty of finding time for the two occupations. The Turf is not fit for the clergy, as most people will be inclined to say, because, as at present managed, it is a demoralizing amusement. One of the evils which a clergyman ought to denounce is the taste for gambling; and horse-racing is rapidly becoming more and more decidedly a mere alternative to *rouge-et-noir*. Admitting that it is not necessarily immoral for half a dozen gentlemen to try whose horse can run the fastest, it must be added that this is by no means an exhaustive description of modern horse-racing. The crowd which is to be found upon our race-courses is not exactly in the frame of mind appropriate to divine service; nor does its conduct generally imply that it has much laid to heart the teaching of any variety of clergyman. The practices which are fostered by betting men are not exactly in harmony with an elevated system of Christian ethics. A man, in short, who should preach on Sundays and attend race-courses on week-days would probably have to rub shoulders for six days with all the vices which he denounces on the seventh. He would be bound to warn any of his congregation that, if they chose to go upon the Turf, they would be trying the old experiment of touching pitch without being defiled; and it would scarcely encourage a belief in his sincerity if he at once proceeded to try the experiment himself. A sufficiently ingenious excuse indeed has been put forward by some of the sporting newspapers. They admit that the Turf is in great need of purification, and they ask how it is to be purified if all honourable men should stand aloof. Mr. King, they say, and doubtless with perfect truth, is a perfectly honourable man; he has nothing to do with betting or with any of the doubtful practices which it fosters, and acts up to the good old theory which regards racing as a means of improving the breed of horses. This, of course, raises the old question how far a man is justified in doing what is in itself innocent when it incidentally becomes a temptation to others. In this case the answer does not seem to be very doubtful. The mere fact that a perfectly honourable man keeps racehorses without himself sanctioning any practices does not necessarily tend to improve the moral atmosphere. It may at least be said with just as much probability that rogues flourish because they are more or less sanctioned by honest people. If the Turf simply consisted of a number of knaves preying upon each other, it would be a nuisance to be suppressed as soon as possible. The fact that it is still patronized by many men of undoubted honour is that which enables

it to hold its ground. Therefore an honest man who keeps racehorses is encouraging an institution which is, to say the least, of very doubtful tendencies; and if his profession is one which imposes upon him the duty of inculcating moral improvement, he cannot be excused for the negative merit of not actually doing wrong himself. He incurs a certain responsibility by mixing in such an occupation, and could only be excused if he took active measures to put down the abuses which threaten to make it an unmixed nuisance. It would of course be a further question, which we need not argue, whether even in that case he would not act more effectually by denouncing the evil from outside.

This consideration suggests the true reason why a clergyman should be required to observe a higher standard than other men. He cannot, it may be said, be excused simply on the ground of his personal innocence. He is bound to carry on a warfare against the evils of modern society, as well as to abstain from fostering them. And yet there is some difficulty in measuring the force of this distinction. Every man, clergyman or layman, is bound to protest, so far as opportunity serves, against the corruptions which he encounters. If a clergyman has a more definite position and more frequent opportunities of discharging this duty than other men, it does not follow that others are free from the same obligation within their own sphere of employment. In fact, the question cannot be fully solved without inquiring into the true meaning of the clerical calling. People who take the highest view of that calling will naturally be inclined, as a matter of propriety and decorum, if not as a matter of absolute duty, to draw a deeper line between the amusements permitted to the clergy and to the laity. In this, as in many other apparently trivial questions, we find that we are really coming upon profound contrasts of belief. What appears to be merely a question of external manners really runs up into questions about our most solemn conceptions of duty and of the universe. Without entering upon any such speculations, we may remark that the scandal given by such cases as that of Mr. King illustrates a great social change. In Mr. Herbert Spencer's phraseology, the clerical type is being more and more differentiated from the ordinary lay type. This may or may not be on the whole an advantage, but it certainly tends to the disappearance of a character which was not without its merits. The old-fashioned clergyman who has in him a touch of the country gentleman has been in his day a very useful member of society. He had his faults undoubtedly. The special interests of his profession might suffer from his other propensities. Perhaps he hated poachers so intensely as to be rather blind to the poor man's temptations, and was sometimes more interested in improving the breed of pigs than in attending to the souls of his parishioners. Yet his interest in the ordinary pursuits of his neighbours was not altogether a bad thing. He struck deep roots into the soil, and was an important member of the social organism. We generally abuse the eighteenth-century parson as a sordid and selfish kind of person. His religion was not of an exalted type, and consisted to a great extent in a hearty hatred for what he called enthusiasts—that is to say, for anybody who, like Wesley and Whitefield, tried to rouse the people from a comfortable indifference. He was not so averse to a job as he ought to have been; he was apt to seek for promotion by unworthy concessions to possible patrons; and if he became a bishop, he thought it only proper to save a comfortable fortune out of his revenues, and to present his nearest relations to all the best livings in the diocese. Doubtless we have cleared away a great many abuses, and our present race of clergymen take a higher view of their duties and are more devoted to their proper work. But we generally begin to recognize the merits of an old institution when we lose it, and there are some charms in the domestic quiet of the Georgian period, when the Church was not yet torn by furious party spirit, and many excellent clergymen led a good homely patriarchal life, surrounded by their families and respected by their parishioners. Their sermons were undoubtedly sleep-compelling, and their churches shocked all modern notions of architectural propriety. They doubted the advantages of schools, and were absolutely impenetrable to new ideas. But the thought of that era of comparative repose is in some ways agreeable in these more feverish times, and we cannot help fancying that the old-fashioned parson, who was not so much of a priest and a good deal more of the farmer, was sometimes superior to his more straitlaced successor if he occasionally also degenerated into a Trulliber. As the old order changes we look back with some regret, though we must confess that a man ought to live in his own century, and has to be suppressed when he survives too far into another.

FASTOLF AS A STEPFATHER.

FAR up among the oolite hills of Wiltshire, close to the debateable country of Slaughterford and Yatton, lies the narrow valley of Castle Combe. The village at its head was once a place of some importance, but it has now little attraction for the tourist. The church is, in a sense, ancient; but its look of antiquity has been carefully "restored" away. The House which closely adjoined it, and which for a dozen generations was the inheritance of the Scopes, has been deserted by a new owner for a more healthy if less interesting site, and very soon few traces will remain of a family which, after having in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries overshadowed the land, is now reduced to the one remaining stem which has never left its native Wensleydale.

The Scropes of Castle Combe were little distinguished. Their founder, one of the favourites of Richard II., and high in the service of his successor, was the only man of eminence the house produced, if we except the last of his race, the genial author of *Deer Stalking*. But William Scrope was not the first literary man of his family, though Stephen Scrope, his ancestor, is almost forgotten; except for the one great misfortune of his life, we should seldom recall his name or his writings. On the tower of Castle Combe church there is a shield of arms which belongs to no Wiltshire family, but every villager can point it out to the visitor, and few are so ignorant or so wise as not to smile as they remark that it was placed upon the wall by the famous Sir John Falstaff.

The true character of Fastolf as it comes out in the Paston Letters is not very different from that which Shakspeare has drawn under the name of Falstaff; and the revelations made by the Pastons and their correspondents are fully borne out by various other pieces of contemporary evidence. Sir John was not, as we have lately in some places been told to believe, a very estimable hero in the French wars. The whole story of his foreign adventures has considerable interest. Whether he lost the battle of Patay and won the "battle of the Herrings," whether he killed the Duke of Alençon at Agincourt or only took the Duke's son at Vermeuil, we need not pause here to inquire. His matrimonial relations are so curious, and connected him with so many remarkable characters, that it may be quite worth while to examine them by themselves. Why Shakspeare should have selected him to play the part first assigned to Sir John Oldcastle, why he should have given him so unenviable a notoriety, why he should have deprived him of his social rank—for he was a Knight of the Garter—and other questions of the same kind have been very fully discussed by students of Shakspeare; but that he is not unjustly vilified under the character of "sweet Jack" appears plainly enough by some of his letters in the Paston correspondence, as for instance, when he writes to his agent at Caistor, "I pray you send me word who dare be so hardy to kick against you in my right, and say to them on my behalf that they shall be quyt as far as law and reason will; and if they will not dread nor obey, then they shall be quyt by Blackbeard or Whitebeard, that is to say by God or the devil." In an article on Jack Cade's rebellion published some years ago in the *Fortnightly Review* Mr. Gairdner quoted this letter in elucidation of Fabyan's "Bluebeard and other counterfeit names." Mr. Gairdner's authority is deservedly high, but he seems to have stumbled here. Fastolf's strong language contains apparently a reference to the dresses worn by the prominent characters in some popular miracle-play.

Fastolf himself was of a good and wealthy family, which flourished not without credit in the Eastern counties during the thirteenth and two following centuries; and one of them was Sheriff of London in the year in which Sir Nicholas Brember, Richard II.'s "Duke of Troy," was hanged at Tyburn. Lord Kimberley represents, in the female line, the senior branch of the family, which was seated at Kimberley Park. A younger son's son, and a minor at the time of his father's death, John Fastolf early made acquaintance with the harsh customs which he afterwards himself used to such purpose. We first hear of him in Ireland, whither he had accompanied Richard II., and where he seems to have remained during the government of Sir Stephen Scrope, who was Lord Deputy under Henry IV., or rather Lord Deputy's deputy. Sir Stephen and his two brothers were the husbands of the Tiptoft co-heiresses, and Castle Combe was the inheritance of the Lady Millicent. When Sir Stephen left her a widow, which he did in 1408, she was rich, if not very young, and her children were minors. Her little boy was eight or nine at the most, and his sister—for there were but the two living—probably younger. Sir Stephen died in Ireland, and in those days Ireland was a long way from Wiltshire. How was she to return without an escort, and who was so well fitted to undertake the charge as the young Norfolk knight who had been long devoted to her lamented lord? He was now twenty-eight, while she was thirty-six at the least. But such small discrepancies were little thought of then, and widows, especially rich ones, were not expected to wait long in mourning. Lady Millicent, if one account is to be trusted, was however very discreet in this matter, for it was not until Sir Stephen had been dead for eleven months that she accepted the hand of Sir John. She showed some prudence in her prenuptial arrangements, for her new husband bound himself, we read, to pay her 100*l.* a year pin-money, and the payment was continued until 1445. Except in this matter, there is little further mention of Lady Millicent; but a poem is still extant which was possibly written by her son, in which she is eulogized for her virtues, and her life of thirty-seven years as wife of Sir John Fastolf is spoken of, but without a word as to conjugal felicity or any such topic.

Sir John had no sooner married the dowager than he began to arrange for the heir's disposal so as best to advantage himself. A still more distinguished and scarcely less famous knight is brought on the scene. One or two recent revelations have done much to dethrone Sir William Gascoigne from the pedestal he long occupied. His concurrence with Fastolf on this occasion is among them. While the boy Scrope was still of tender years, Gascoigne purchased his wardship for a sum which may be calculated at about 3,500*l.* in our money. Nor was the minor's consent asked. A complaint is still extant in which Stephen says that the transaction took place in the very year of Fastolf's marriage with his mother. But within a short time we find him back again in the custody of his stepfather. Whether Gascoigne's disgrace on the accession of Henry V., or whether the loss of her sole remain-

ing child made the Lady Millicent wish for her son and persuade her husband to grant her the favour, we cannot guess, but poor Scrope says, "He bought me and sold me as a beste, against all right and lawe." He further enumerates a number of injuries and damages in goods and chattels which he had received from his stepfather, but the great point of the complaint is of a different kind. While he was away from home he received some bodily hurt, we cannot now say what, and if we interpret him aright he became a cripple for life, for he "took sykeness a xiiij or xiv yere's swyng, whereby," he adds, "I am disfigured in person and shall be whilst I live." He does not seem to have ever been knighted, and probably some deformity precluded him from carrying arms.

Stephen Scrope's grievances were destined to be of very long standing. Fastolf survived till 1459, and, having once grasped the estate, was in no hurry to let it go. Though his wife died thirteen years before him, he continued in possession during his life, for he had persuaded his stepson to sign a deed while very young, and probably unaware of the meaning of the act, by virtue of which he remained undisturbed, even refusing the young man's very reasonable request to have Castle Combe to farm. To have granted it would have been to interrupt the course of action on which he had early entered. During his tenancy of the estate he administered its affairs chiefly through a certain William, whose surname is a question, for he was called both Botoner and Wyrester, a man not unknown to fame, of whom a full account is to be found in the Paston Letters and other places. To Fastolf he made himself very useful as steward, secretary, herald, and indeed factotum. Many documents in his handwriting have come to light lately, and are noticed by the local archaeologists. Wyrester's administration is well illustrated by the fate of a sporting parson, one John Grene, who was fined forty marks for some depredations in the park, and by that of a predecessor of Grene's, who, with three other clergymen, was convicted of poaching, and duly amerced by the remorseless William. It is still a question whether Wyrester, or Stephen Scrope's cousin, the Earl of Worcester, was the translator of Caxton's edition of "Tully." Another of Fastolf's most ready instruments was Thomas Howys, or Howis, who was also parson of Castle Combe. It is to Howis, then in Norfolk, that he wrote the letter quoted above. He became Sir John's executor, and persuaded him to leave some money for the repair of the churches on his estates; it is probably owing to this bequest that the Fastolf arms appear on the Castle Combe tower.

If Fastolf was hard upon Scrope in the matter of the estate, he was not more lenient in that of the wardship. He took him to France in one of his expeditions, but at Honfleur the young man fell into disgrace with the local authorities, and had the mortification of seeing Sir John take part against him. He managed to escape to England and took refuge with his mother; but it is very characteristic of Fastolf to find that he insisted on Scrope making a payment for his board at home, and at last turned him out of doors on account of his impecuniosity. Soon after this Scrope married, in order, as was said, to find a home, but how marriage conducted to that end does not very clearly appear. Fastolf, perfectly consistent, now demanded his fine of 500 marks for his ward's marriage, and actually obtained the money after incessant importunity extending over many years.

A side light is thrown upon Stephen Scrope's character by a manuscript in the Harleian collection, of which Mr. Blades gives an account in his *Life of Caxton*. It is on paper, and consists of a translation of the *Dits Moraux des Philosophes*, which in a different translation was Caxton's first book printed in England with a date. The paper is in poor condition, but part of the colophon is still legible and runs thus:—"Now late translatyd out of French tynge in to Englysh the yer of our Lord Meecl. to John Fostalf knyght for his contemplacōn and solas by Stevyn Scrope squyer some in law to the said Fostalle. Deo gracias." This dedication places Scrope in an amiable light; how the offering was received does not appear. By an amusing mistake Mr. Blades speaks of Fastolf as Sir John Fastolf Bart. He was a banneret, which may have led to the error, but it is one of the very few to be found in the book.

Scrope's marriage, or marriages, furnishes another curious example of Fastolf's disposition. One of the first of the Paston Letters is a request to his stepson to use his influence to corrupt a certain judge, his wife's father. Whether this was Sir William Yelverton or Sir Richard Bingham does not appear. Scrope was twice married, and each time to the daughter of a judge, and Fastolf wishes it should be delicately conveyed that a reward might be had by a perversion of justice.

At length, in November 1459, after an illness which lasted one hundred and forty-eight days, he died at Caistor. His will still exists at Magdalene College, Oxford, and some account of it and other documents relating to him occurs in the recent Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. It was made in June, therefore near the beginning of his illness, but was only proved by Paston and Howis, his executors, in 1467. Fastolf himself had taught them that possession is nine points of law, and they did not fail to make use of their knowledge. His wishes were never carried out as to the foundation of a college at Caistor, and much of his property was wasted in litigation as to the authenticity of a will "nuncupative," which he was said to have made on his deathbed. Two things seem certain—namely, that Stephen Scrope, by whose property he had so largely increased his own means, received nothing from him, and that Magdalene College, which has hitherto reckoned him among its benefactors, and still owns some lands

which once were his, only obtained them by the adroitness of Bishop Waynflete, the rest of the estate going to Sir John Paston. As for Castle Combe, when poor Scrope at last came into possession he was already an old man.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS AT BRIGHTON.

THE Church Congress has fairly won recognition as an element in the English Church system existing under an informal charter, and wielding nothing more tangible than influence, but at the same time meeting wants which a more precisely organized body might perhaps be too inelastic to supply. Each Congress must accordingly be judged by the wisdom shown in the selection of its subjects, the ability with which they are treated, the representative character of the gathering, and the numbers and tone of the audience which listens to the discussions. We cannot complain of the one which has just concluded at Brighton in any of these particulars. In the matter of numbers it was larger than any of its predecessors. It has also set a good example to all which may come after it in the general toleration which every party has shown for the very decidedly pronounced opinions of persons with whom for the rest of the year they are in their respective Unions and Associations in a condition of chronic warfare. There was indeed one storm when an indiscreet county member broke in upon a peaceable and solid debate on the constitutional character of Convocation with a stump appeal to that body to sweep out of the rubrics everything which the gallant representative for West Sussex was pleased to think Romanizing, or be for ever fallen. But Colonel Barttelot had only himself to blame for the disturbance. Not only were his remarks barely within the question by a strained interpretation of its wording, but they came from a member who had made himself prominent by the heat with which he had supported the Public Worship Bill, and were addressed to a meeting partly composed of those who, being his constituents, had no taste for being so lectured, and partly of those who, not being his constituents, resented seeing the Church Congress turned into the hustings for Sussex. His outburst was accordingly accepted as a challenge to Archbishops and aggrieved parishioners to make the Act as vindictive in its operation as possible, and was received accordingly. A second storm which had nearly broken out on a similar provocation was adroitly allayed by the Bishop of Chichester bespeaking a hearing for the speaker—a clergyman whose antecedents ought to have saved him from so false a position—on the ground that he seemed to be “now” approaching the question. Those whose love for the Church of England and its Congresses was of the negative order exulted over these passing gusts as hopeful signs of an immense tempest on the following morning, when the discussion of the fabrics and the services of the Church in relation to the wants of the times could so readily be turned into a free fight over the Public Worship Act. These prophets of ill were signally disconcerted by the result, for although the vast Dome of the Pavilion was crowded with the hot spirits of both sides, the discussion went off in perfect good temper, with no references to the irritating Act, and with just so much divergence of views as to make it lively. The speaking, which was preponderatingly on the side which is desirous of maintaining the more ceremonious character of English worship, very conclusively showed that any attempt under the Bill of the Archbishop, or of any other man, to enforce a dead level of puritanical austerity in our congregational devotions could only result in a bitter conflict, out of which the Church itself could hardly emerge as an Establishment.

The keynote of harmony had no doubt been very happily struck at the first of the meetings, for which a subject was wisely chosen well calculated to take the thoughts of the members present out of their purely insular troubles and disputes. The Old Catholic movement was the topic selected, and the Conference at Bonn, although it had come off subsequently to the selection of the subject, very naturally gave the tone to the speaking. It was indeed noted with regret that some who had been present there, particularly the Bishop of Winchester and Professor Mayor, might have advantageously spoken more directly upon the details of the incident, in preference to falling back upon the general question, about which we know so much already. Still the discussion was valuable, if only as eliciting the sympathies of Englishmen on grounds of a cognate Churchmanship with the first Continental movement which has ever within their memory thrown off the burden of Ultramontaniam without at the same time repudiating the salutary restraints of a traditional organization. The solitary protest which the Bishop of Melbourne made against the general expression of feeling, on grounds of a puritanism which was so narrow as almost to be old-fashioned even in the mouth of a votary of Exeter Hall, only threw into higher relief the genuine sympathy of those who were present for the Old Catholic cause.

There was much lively talking one morning upon the question of patronage, out of which three conclusions might have been drawn—that the actual system of patronage was liable to many objections, some theoretical and others practical; that it was much easier to put one's finger on these objections than to show any feasible way of meeting them; but that of all conceivable remedies the very worst would be one which should weaken or destroy the existing system of private patronage, under which the clergy of England have neither sunk into ranting demagogues nor been in-

flated into a sacerdotal caste. The debate upon Convocation, which was supplemented by one upon Diocesan Conferences, had the advantage of being started by writers—Lord Alwyne Compton and Canon Trevor—who had acquired a wide practical knowledge as leading members of the body of its history and working; and, with the exception of the unlucky interruptions to which we have referred, it kept up its character. Advocates were not wanting to argue that it was the duty of that ancient representation of the clergy to commit the suicidal process of converting itself into a mixed assembly of clergy and laity, in hopes of purchasing immediate popularity at the price of forfeiting its ancient constitutional character. The balance, however, of argument demonstrated that while the internal balance of clerical interests in Convocation might well be readjusted, and while it was highly expedient that the laity should obtain, wherever possible, additional facilities for making their opinions felt and their voices heard, yet there was no sufficient cause why the clergy should be deprived of their one opportunity of considering their own affairs on their own responsibility. In the meanwhile it struck some of the speakers that, while theorists were busying themselves to devise opportunities for lay co-operation and something like lay legislation within the Church, the thing had been quietly but rapidly creating itself in that network of diocesan conferences which is overspreading the land, and out of which might possibly be evoked some central body in correspondence, though not amalgamated, with Convocation.

Among the most remarkable of the papers which were read at the other meetings was one by Professor Pritchard, who, in fully and enthusiastically dwelling upon the marvels of modern discovery, most earnestly protested against the narrow and unphilosophical vanity which busies itself with seeking, among the multiplied instances of an all-wise and all-powerful First Cause, for arguments in favour of a vague and hopeless materialism. The topic might be challenged as not within the direct objects of a Church Congress, but the diversion was well timed. The antagonism between religion and science, between faith and discovery, is the figment not of the thoughtful Churchman nor of the real philosopher, but of the men with whom theorizing is chiefly valuable as it ministers to the importance of self; and therefore the sooner and the more completely it is dissipated by thinkers whose authority to think will be acknowledged alike by the votaries of religion and the students of science, the better it will be for both causes.

We are told that next year the Congress is to be reassembled at Stoke-upon-Trent. It was certainly a bold act on the part of its managers to suggest to a mixed multitude fresh from the gilded saloons of the Pavilion, full of the Aquarium and the breezy idleness of the beach and the piers, that they should adjourn to the reek and cinder-heaps of Hanley and Longton. The fact that the proposal was not only made but cheerfully accepted shows that the frequenters of the Congress do not avail themselves of it as a mere excitement for the autumn. The choice of Stoke was, we think, wisely made in the higher interests of the body for whose benefit the Congress exists, for it is a place in which Churchmanship is carrying on an uphill fight with Dissent in every form. The exhibition in such a community of the Church as a large and complex corporate institution, with interests and pursuits founded upon its own definite principles, but yet co-extensive in their aims with the nation and not with any single sect, cannot fail to produce an impression which will be as beneficial as perhaps it may be novel.

THE ABOLITION OF SECOND CLASS.

IT is easy to understand the process of reasoning which has probably led the Midland Railway Company to the determination to abolish second-class carriages, but it may be doubted whether the experiment is not, at least at the present moment, rash and inconsiderate. The effect of the recent large extension of facilities for third-class traffic has naturally been to empty the second-class carriages. In point of accommodation there is extremely little difference between a second and a third-class carriage. The only real advantage of the former is that it usually enables travellers to avoid the rough companionship to which they are occasionally exposed in the lowest class of all; but many persons are tempted to run this risk for the sake of what on a long journey is a substantial economy. It appears that between 1870 and 1873 the number of railway passengers in England and Wales has increased by much more than a third, and the passenger receipts by more than a fourth, and almost the whole of this increase occurs in the case of third-class traffic. The first class remains almost stationary, the second class steadily declines, while the third class grows with astonishing rapidity. It is evident, therefore, that what the second class has been losing the third class has been gaining; and the question which the Midland, like other Companies, has had to consider is how to win back the second-class passengers who are thus slipping away into the third class. The most obvious way in which this might be done would be to make the second class cheaper and more attractive, and thus tempt passengers to pay something more than third-class fare for the sake of a more select and comfortable carriage. Before abolishing the second class it would surely be worth while to see what can be got out of it by managing it in a rational way. As a rule, second-class traffic has never had justice done to it. The higher fare which is charged for it is out of all proportion to the difference in accommodation between second and third class, and the consequence is that the second class is used only by persons who cannot

afford the highest price, but who shrink from the unpleasant contingencies of the lowest. The reason why the Companies have not done more for this neglected class is no doubt that they were afraid of thereby losing first-class passengers; but it is quite possible to make the second class more tempting, while leaving a wide margin of luxury and exclusiveness for those who are willing to pay the highest price of all. The arrangement which is proposed by the Midland is represented as a boon to second-class passengers, and to some extent it is so. They are told that they will be enabled to ride first class for rather less than what they now pay. As, however, return tickets are to be abolished, it is possible that the fares will practically not be less than at present; and all that second-class passengers will thus obtain will be the increased dignity and comfort of sitting in first-class carriages. This, however, is not what, as a rule, passengers of this grade are anxious about. What they really want is plain accommodation at a cheap rate, which shall yet be somewhat higher than the fare of the class in which roughs and vagrants necessarily travel. On the other hand, it can hardly be doubted that the threatened change will not be welcomed by the present first-class passengers, the majority of whom would certainly much rather pay the existing fares, or even more, and be left to stretch their legs at ease in a moderately-filled compartment than be packed closely and hotly together at a lower charge. The luxury of first-class travelling chiefly consists in having a liberal allowance of room; and if people are willing to pay more for this sort of exclusiveness, it is hard to see why they should not be indulged. It has been justly remarked that the abolition of the second class will practically mean the suppression of the first in the sense in which it has hitherto been understood; and this seems to be a very wanton and perverse arrangement. The Midland Company no doubt hope by reducing the carriages to two classes to tempt a large number of the passengers who have forsaken the second class for the third to travel first class, and this may probably be the result. But the same financial result might be obtained by lowering the second-class fares, and keeping the first-class as it is. In this way the former would be really benefited without the latter being disturbed.

There is, of course, no reason why a Railway Company should not from time to time revise its charges, under such limitations as Parliament has imposed, with a view to increase its revenue, and there is certainly no restriction on a voluntary reduction of fares. It will be observed, however, that the change which the Midland Company is about to make is not merely a financial, but to some extent a social, revolution. It is natural that the arrangements for the accommodation of the public should correspond to the actual composition of society; and nobody can doubt that there are three distinctly marked classes to be provided for on the railways. There are the people to whom the expense of a journey is comparatively a matter of indifference, and who are anxious to obtain the most luxurious accommodation, without regard to price; at the other end of the scale there are those who must of necessity travel at the lowest possible outlay, no matter how poor the accommodation may be. Between these two classes there is a third, composed of persons whose means will not justify them in spending money on pure luxury, but who yet can afford to pay something more than the lowest fare for the sake of a little more comfort, and especially of more select company. The existing arrangements of the railways are adapted to these familiar social divisions, and there is surely a foolish wantonness in attempting to ignore or to repudiate them. Mr. Gladstone a short time since recommended the plan which the Midland Company are about to adopt, on the ground that his financial experience led him to the conclusion that "the State, or individual, or Company thrives best which dives deepest down into the mass of the community, and adapts its arrangements to the wants of the greatest number." This is one of those large, vaguely expressed theories in which Mr. Gladstone delights. In one sense, it may be supposed to mean that a public Company should not concentrate its attention upon one class of society, but should endeavour to provide equally for all. In another sense, it might seem to imply that the Company ought to devote itself exclusively to meet the particular wants of the largest class of the community, and leave other classes to take their share of this provision or go without. It is on the latter principle that the Tramway Companies have apparently been allowed to monopolize a number of important thoroughfares in London and in other towns. The tramway-cars are no doubt largely patronized by what may be called the "mass of the community," and consequently the roads are given up to them, and other people who may desire a more rapid or independent mode of conveyance are practically excluded. However desirable it may be that the poorer classes should have the advantage of cheap locomotion, it is obviously carrying the principle too far to limit other classes to the same means of transit. In the United States the sacred principle of equality of citizenship requires that there shall be only one class of carriage on the railways, although in practice the rule is evaded by various expedients. On the Continent there is a familiar saying that only fools and Englishmen travel first class; but after all this is a very innocent kind of folly, and if the fools are willing to pay for it, it is difficult to see why they should not be allowed to do so. There is no doubt a great deal of what may be called snobbishness on the part of a large section of first-class passengers. It is supposed by many persons to be a badge of social distinction to travel in this way. It is, in fact, one of the ways in which small people can for the time put themselves on a level with big people. There is nothing above

the first-class express except a special train, and special trains are the privilege of princes and railway directors. In the train, therefore, a sort of equality with great folk may be established at a very moderate cost. There is a sweet satisfaction to some minds in reflecting that, for a little while at least, they are in as distinguished a position as it is possible to attain. It is not everybody who can live in Belgrave Square or drive as good horses as a colliery-owner or a duke; but the first-class carriage is within reach of many people, and first class, while the train runs, is top of the tree. In a country like England there are always a considerable number of people who are only too glad of an opportunity of spending money if they can only acquire some sort of distinction by doing so, and it is difficult to discover any reason why the Railway Companies should not make a legitimate profit out of the weaknesses of human nature. It is not particularly the business of the Midland Company to put down snobbishness or exclusiveness. Its principal duty is to earn a good dividend for the shareholders, and it is more likely to succeed in doing so if it accommodates itself to the natural habits and convenience of the public than by attempting to coerce its customers into a fantastic equality.

There are special reasons in the nature of the traffic on the Midland system which have no doubt influenced the decision in regard to the abolition of second class, and which do not operate to an equal degree in the case of other Companies. The third-class receipts on the Midland are not far short of a million, and the first-class only 210,000*l.*, while the London and North-Western derives three-quarters of a million from its first-class traffic and a million and a half from the third. It is only natural, therefore, that the Midland Company should attach comparatively little importance to their first-class traffic, and should endeavour to get rid of the trouble of it as far as possible by amalgamating it with the second. To some extent the course upon which the Midland are about to enter must, if persisted in, have an influence on the arrangements of other Companies; but it is scarcely probable that the example will be generally followed. The wisest policy which a Railway Company can pursue is, not to devote itself exclusively to the cultivation of one description of traffic, but to endeavour to afford equal facilities to all. There is no reason why travellers should be arbitrarily limited to a choice between two kinds of carriages any more than to a uniform rate of speed. Some people like to travel quickly, others are content to go slowly; some set their hearts upon soft cushions, while others are satisfied with hard deal boards; some think only of comfort, others only of price; and it would seem to be the business of a Railway Company, as of any other purveyor, to endeavour as far as possible to suit all tastes. Perhaps if there is one thing more than another which the public is anxious about at the present moment, it is neither extra cushions nor cheaper fares, but greater safety; and the Railway Companies would do well for themselves in making such arrangements as would produce a more comfortable feeling on this point.

A DAY WITH THE FUNGUS-HUNTERS.

ANOTHER fungus feast, and no casualties! Once more have the mycologists, indigenous and other, hunted and harried the woods, fir-groves, and pastures of Herefordshire in pursuit of game which squires do not care to preserve, and to which farmers do not raise the faintest objection. Once more have they returned towards dusk to the "faithful city," bearing bags and baskets filled with spoil destined to give variety to more than one cuisine. So far has the adoption of the study of mycology, as a special feature of the Woolhope Field Club transactions, tended in six years to "Italianize" the tastes of diners-out in the matter of fungi, that we believe the excellence of a "Lycoperdon" fritter might be avouched by the highest ecclesiastical dignitaries; and, unless our eyes deceived us, the High Sheriff of the county of Hereford could certify the goodness of "Comatus" soup. It is not of course contended that among the results of the forays which made the woods of Downton, Stoke Edith, Dinmore, and Garnstone all alive in the first week of October there were not a number of diverse toadstools, wholly unfit for human food; but a residuum of edible fungi was tried, tested, and not found fault with by the guests at the public dinner on the first of the month, who, though disappointed of the presence of the Rev. M. Berkeley, the chief of English mycologists, included in their number those scarcely less eminent authorities, Messrs. Broome, Rennie, and Houghton, to say nothing of that skilful delineator and describer of fungus-growths, Mr. Worthington Smith, F.L.S. The proceedings of the evening included a merited recognition of the assistance rendered to the Club by this gentleman, whose two sheets distinguishing edible from poisonous fungi, with the key appertaining to them (published by Hardwicke), are still the most useful guide to the amateur fungus-hunter, though for more advanced inquirers the manuals of Berkeley and Cook, and, for the more classically minded, the charming volume of Dr. Badham, are doubtless more suitable. The delicately-served *Marasmius* orecades, or "Fairy Ring Champignon," enabled the veteran Mr. Lees to return for the hundredth time to his "molar" theory as to fairy rings; the orange-milked mushroom (*Lactarius deliciosus*) justified its title, after skilful cooking and a good deal of salting and peppering; and if on this occasion we failed to experiment upon the scaly agaric (*Procerus*), the beefsteak that is cut to order from half way up the oak (*Festulina hepatica*), or

the *Boletus edulis* (not that in favour with the elder Roman gourmands, though very popular with their remote posterity), or even the Giant Puffball (*Lycoperdon giganteum*), it is simply because, in the case of fungus-tasting as in everything else, "non omnia possumus omnes." The *Lactarius deliciosus* ought to be good, to judge from its name; and its beauty of colouring and deep orange milk so completely distinguish it from the dangerous *L. torminosus*, the deadly and ruddy *L. rufus*, the fragrant and rare *L. glycosmus*, *L. controversus* (a species not uncommonly found under the black poplar, but on this occasion discovered by Dr. McCullough under a Lombardy poplar at Garnstone), and the *L. Vitellinus*, which, notwithstanding its epithet, is not good for food, that there need not be the slightest hesitation in tasting it, even raw. Dr. Badham's plan of baking the *Deliciosus*, after due application of salt, pepper, and butter, for three-quarters of an hour in a covered pie-dish, is doubtless a preferable mode of experimenting on this delicacy. Our own experience of it is not so fortunate as to enable us to rank it with the most appetizing of culinary fungi, nor can we mention it in the same day with the slices of the Giant Puff-ball when, after the removal of their outer integument, they are dipped in yolk of egg, and then fried in fresh butter. In all such experiments it is obviously unfair to try other than quite fresh and young specimens, and there ought to be no necessity for cautioning even the uninitiated against cooking the puff-ball when it is yellow and rotten inside, or indeed when its snow-white exterior is beginning to change to a suspicious yellow. Several of the rarer *Lactarii* mentioned above were either found in this year's forays at Hereford or were brought thither to adorn the sideboard at the festival.

A word must be added about the "Comatus" soup. What boy or girl accustomed to roam over field and pasture does not know the quaint cylindrical "tall John," with a fleshy and patchy white wig, and a hollow stem with a white powdery fragile ring encircling it, known to mycologists as the "*Coprinus comatus*," and sometimes as the "agaric of civilization"; but hardly less familiar to hundreds who cannot put a name to it, and who come across it and its grey-capped cousin *C. Atramentarius*, in the open garden or at the base of stumps or palings? This fungus has long been mixed with others in the composition of ketchup, and *Atramentarius* is said to make very good ink. It has been reserved for the Woolhope Club to demonstrate its value as the principal ingredient in a piquant and tasty soup, to outward appearance resembling green-pea soup, or perhaps more closely parsley and butter in a tureen. Whatever its semblance, it is too good an addition to our list of soups to be lightly forgotten; and perhaps the day will yet come when those philosophers whose mental grasp can embrace nothing higher than the addition of another and another novelty to their gastronomic pleasures may learn to count amongst their benefactors the motley group of mycologists whom an inscribed festoon in one of the streets at the recent opening of the Free Library at Hereford designates irreverently and illiterately as the "Fungi Fodies." After all, however, even putting the question of edibility aside, it is not difficult to find good reasons for prosecuting the study of mycology. Medicinally and industrially many fungi have their special purpose, as for instance the scaly *Polyporus*, which, dried and cut into strips, supplies a capital razor strop, and the other species of the same group which are manufactured into the styptic known as *Amadou* or German Tinder. The medicinal substance known as ergot of rye has also, it need hardly be said, a fungoid origin. Generally, too, to quote the highest English authority on the subject, "the office of fungi in the organized world is to check exuberant growth, to facilitate decomposition, to regulate the balance of the component parts of the atmosphere, to promote fertility, and to nourish myriads of the smaller members of the animal kingdom." Regarded in this practical light, the numerous family of funguses asserts a strong title to intelligent study, and cannot lightly be overlooked by any Field Club that deserves its name. An attempt to catalogue the fungi which line the woodland path, or have their habitation at the foot or amid the branches of the oak, ash, elm, the larch and fir, the birch and the poplar, would very soon more than exhaust our paper. Amidst the things of beauty—though certainly not of joy to the incautious taster—in fungus life may be cited the *Boletus luridus*, amber-coloured above, and bright red or even vermilion below, and suspiciously changing, when broken or bruised, to a blue complexion. Or, again, the Fly Agaric (*Agaricus [Amanita] muscarius*), with its bright scarlet cap, worked, so to speak, with yellow or yellowish spots, and underlaid with a bright yellow flesh, which is succeeded, lower still, by a pervading white. Its stem is bulbous and marked by a distinctive ring. The *Peziza aurantia* is another perfectly lovely tenant of the woods and heaths, a delicate crisping "lamina" of the brightest orange, which no one will forget who saw the other day a specimen of it, measuring eight and a half inches across, sent from Shobdon Court by Lord Bateman. Amongst the Russulas, found freely this year as usual in Herefordshire, there is as great a variety of hue as of wholesomeness, from the pale pink and faint rose to the brilliant scarlet of *R. emetica*. *Cortinarius cinnabarinus* is a clustering group, of a bright orange or nearly vermilion, with a metallic lustre. The Cinnamon Mushroom (*Cortinarius Cinnamomeus*) appeals to the sense of smell as well as of seeing, and there are several fungi of which the recent expedition furnished specimens which make the former appeal without any pretence to the latter. Before glancing at these we must just name the violet-capped *Agaricus euchrous*, found at Dinmore Woods on

the 30th of September; the *Coprinus picaceus*, or *Maggie Coprinus*, a rare roadside fungus met with near Downton, the membraned cap of which is variegated with broad white scales, whilst its gills are free and of an ashen black; the mouse-grey *Agaricus gloiocephalus*, of which a large group was exhibited by Dr. Chapman from off the pastures of Burnhill; and the rare, pale-yellow, crisped *Sparassis*, which has been more than once imported into these shows from the fir-groves of Chetwynd by Mr. Houghton. We must also say a word on the odorous fungi, whether sweet-savoured or the contrary. Of the first sort there were found at Stoke Edith *Lactarius glycosmus*, and *Agaricus fragrans* and odoratus; of the second, at Dinmore, the *Agaricus cucumis*, in an abundance commensurate with its strong odour, suggestive of rancid oil or stinking fish. *Ag. saponaceus*, too, was offered to our scrutiny, but pronounced, after deliberation, to savour more of fish oil than of soap; and the interest displayed in Dr. Chapman's fine group of *Gloiocephalus* was to a certain extent qualified by its exceedingly repulsive smell. Occasionally in the course of the forays one lighted on a family of fungi, such as *Agaricus mucidus*, the associations of which are more with the touch than the sight or smell. Unpleasantly slimy, it arrested the notice of the Woolhopians by its profusion at a certain point in Stoke Edith woods, both on the ground itself and on the tall fine grown beeches, which are its home.

The mention of these silvan beauties suggests another element of interest in fungus-hunting—namely, the introduction it gives one to the finest timber in our land. As we have said, the fungi love the greenwood. And if, in the recent excursions around Hereford, the curious in such matters were too late by a couple of centuries to see at Stoke Edith the Elizabethan house of many gables, long since superseded by the present stately quadrangular mansion, or at Garnstone the original and characteristic mansion as it appeared in 1675, and was represented in Dingley's sketch, known to readers of the Camden Society's publications, in the place of which is a castellated mansion built by Nash, yet in each case they might have made acquaintance with giant oaks and stately elms which perchance have been the silent witnesses of changes yet earlier than these; oaks and elms still betraying no traces of decrepitude, and still, as of old, giving grace, dignity, and picturesqueness to the landscape. It is not every day that one sees anything so perfect in its way as the great hall at Stoke Edith, the walls and ceilings of which were painted by Sir James Thornhill, or as the geometric flower-garden designed by Nesfield; and yet an explorer might be still better employed in threading the paths of the richly timbered deer-park and making his way to the broad and lofty ridge of Seager Hill, whence he may look out upon the country towards Gloucester, Monmouth, Abergavenny, Bromyard, and Salop, to say nothing of the hill and valley of Woolhope nestling close beneath his standpoint. And so with the demesne of Garnstone; the predominant charm is in the deer-park, and the heights that bound it, the latter commanding exquisite views of North and East Herefordshire, as well as of Shropshire and the mountain barriers of Radnorshire, the former affording a study of single trees and clumps and groups of extreme beauty, such as is not often to be met with. Here a couple of Scotch firs, there a noble spruce or silver fir, arrest the eye by their perfectness of symmetry or their rich contrast of form and colouring with their surroundings. Groups of Spanish chestnuts, clumps of elms, or avenue-like arrangements of the same, promising Wellingtonias, and the like, show how much good taste may achieve, without the aid of a professional landscape-gardener, where the proprietor finds himself possessed of an over-abundance of fine timber, and approaches the task of thinning as a labour of love. Within the lawn and sunk fence at Garnstone, the mycologists were as much struck with the thriving conifers of comparatively recent introduction as with the special denizens of the turf in quest of which they had come. There were perfect samples—for their age—of the *Piceas*, *Nobilis*, *Cephalonica*, and *Pinsapo*, as well as of the Californian *P. bracteata*, the leafy-bracted silver fir, a very promising young tree, which, perhaps on account of a well-chosen aspect, shows here no tendency to premature starting into growth, and thus is less affected by late spring frosts. The complaint of this species generally is the tenderness of its younger growths.

REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION.

THE Commissioners appointed to inquire into the property and income of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and the Colleges and Halls therein have made a complete and business-like Report. The landed estates held by these corporations in England and Wales amount to 319,718 acres, situate in the Southern more than in the Northern counties. We turn with interest to the remarks of the Commissioners as to the management of these large estates. The quantity of land let on beneficial leases is still large, but this tenure is not now so common as it was in former years. The Colleges, like other corporations, have in many cases determined to run out their leases. The existing members have thus sacrificed themselves for the benefit, as is commonly, but not always accurately said, of their successors. In some cases of hospitals the prospective benefit is so large that it may be assumed that the successors of the present incumbents will not be permitted to enjoy the whole of it. However, the income thus arising is likely to be devoted to purposes of education or

charity, and in this sense the existing societies may be said to have sacrificed themselves for the benefit of their successors. The system of beneficial leases has been handed down from the earliest times of the Colleges, and it might probably be shown to have been well suited to the times when it originated. The College or other corporation got in this way money down instead of having to extract it year by year from the tenant, and this may have been formerly an important consideration. But the Commissioners are doubtless right in saying that "at present the system of beneficial leases is detrimental to the pecuniary interest of the foundations." The Commissioners were informed that on the falling in of beneficial leases a large outlay on buildings and other improvements is ordinarily required. The lessees are for the most part under covenants to maintain and repair, but much more is needed at the present time for agricultural estates than what these covenants would enforce. The estates let at rack rent are "reported" (that is, as we understand, by the corporations making the returns) "to be generally in good condition as regards buildings, drainage, and cottages." The Commissioners "have no reason to think that they are below the average in these respects, although there is apparently less outlay than is made by private landlords who improve their properties." The cost of management of these estates appears to the Commissioners "remarkably low." On the whole income it averages only 2*l.* 15*s.* 10*d.* per cent. But the item "charge for management" does not generally include the salary of the financial officer, usually called the "bursar." On the efficiency of management the Commissioners "can form no opinion beyond the general results which are exhibited." But they observe that "the average lettings," the absence of arrears, and the apparently small amount of losses from tenants, testify to the care and vigilance of the bursars. It may be supposed that the Colleges are generally good landlords. Not long ago a case came before a court of law in which it appeared that, an estate being in the market, the tenant made active, and as it turned out successful, efforts to induce a College in Cambridge which had property in the neighbourhood to become the purchaser.

One point, say the Commissioners, is brought prominently out in the result of their inquiry. This is "the great disparity between the property and income of the several Colleges and the numbers of the members." They remark that when that number is small the expense of the staff and the establishment is necessarily large in proportion. But they do not consider that it lies within the scope of their commission to enter further upon this subject, which, we may add, is likely to be industriously pursued by commentators upon their Report. The strongest case of disparity between income and members is probably that of All Souls College, Oxford, which consists of the Warden, 27 Fellows, and 4 Bible Clerks, who are the only undergraduates. The income of the College is about 18,000*l.* a year, and during the next twenty years an increase of nearly 5,000*l.* a year may be expected through the running out of beneficial leases. The principal item of present expenditure for extra-collegiate purposes is the sum of about 1,700*l.* a year paid to University professors. The annual value of an M.A. fellowship is about 27*l.* The expected increase of income is calculated, as we understand, without reference to the fact that during the next twenty years the existing society will be deprived of the fines which would have been payable if the leases proposed to be run out had been renewed. The income of Merton College is upwards of 17,500*l.* a year. There is a Warden, and there are 23 Fellows, and 54 undergraduates "paying tuition fees." It should be explained that, although we use the present tense in quoting from these returns, they refer to the year 1871. The income of Oriel College is upwards of 16,500*l.* There are the Provost and 17 Fellows, and the number of scholars and commoners is 49. The income of New College is upwards of 30,000*l.* a year. It has a Warden and 39 Fellows, and 75 undergraduates. It pays 3,000*l.* a year in scholarships. It appears that upwards of 28,000*l.* has been borrowed by this College "for the purpose of recouping existing beneficiaries for fines receivable on renewals of leases, but not received." The estimated increase of income from the falling in of leases will be by the end of the century nearly 10,000*l.* a year. The College states that a very large expenditure will be incurred for many years to come both for repayment of "fine loans" borrowed and for the purpose of putting into a proper state of repair the estates which will fall into hand. At Cambridge we find that the income of King's College is upwards of 34,000*l.* There are the Provost and 49 Fellows, and the number of undergraduates varies from 22 to 31. The College pays 1,500*l.* a year to scholars and exhibitors. The income of St. John's College is close upon 50,000*l.* There are the Master and 56 Fellows. The College pays nearly 7,000*l.* a year to scholars, exhibitors, &c. The number of undergraduates paying tuition fees is 302. The income of Trinity College is close upon 60,000*l.* a year. There are the Master and 52 Fellows. The College pays upwards of 3,000*l.* a year to scholars and exhibitors. The number of undergraduates paying tuition fees is 446. At Pembroke College the income is upwards of 13,000*l.* a year. There are the Master and 13 Fellows. The number of undergraduates paying tuition fees is 55. This may be taken as a parallel from Cambridge to the case of Oriel College, Oxford, where, as we have seen, the income is 16,500*l.*; there are 17 Fellows, and less than 50 undergraduates paying tuition fees. Another feature of similarity is that each of these Colleges pays nearly 1,000*l.* a year in scholarships and exhibitions. We need hardly remark that it would be a mistake to estimate the utility of a College by the proportion which the number of its undergraduates bears to its

revenue. In past years Oxford has been influenced in a remarkable degree by members of Oriel College, who probably would not have been attracted thither if there had not been fellowships to elect them into. Pembroke College, Cambridge, produced men of high academical distinction at a time when its numbers were certainly not larger than at present. We turn to the *Cambridge University Calendar* for 1853, which happens to be at hand, and we find that it shows only twenty-eight undergraduates at Pembroke College. Yet at that time the College counted among its Fellows Professor Stokes and Dr. Haig Brown, now Head-Master of Charterhouse, who were undergraduates of this "small" College. It appears from the Report that the Heads of nineteen Colleges in Oxford receive 30,000*l.* a year, and the Heads of seventeen Colleges in Cambridge receive 20,000*l.* a year among them. The whole amount paid to Fellows in Colleges in each University is rather over 100,000*l.* a year. The sum paid to scholars and exhibitors out of the corporate income of the Colleges is in each University about 25,000*l.* a year. We give round figures as sufficiently accurate for comparison, and it will be seen from these figures that there is no great difference between the two Universities, either in principle or practice, in the application of their revenues.

Among the matters which the Commissioners regarded as beyond the scope of their powers were several which will be eagerly discussed by commentators on their Report. On one point the Commissioners make no observations of their own, but they desire to call special attention to some "general observations" contained in the answers sent by University College, Oxford, to their queries. The "prevailing opinion" of that society is stated to be that any surplus due to an increase in the available resources of the College, after providing for the adequate remuneration of College officers, and for necessary improvements in College buildings, should be applied towards, we will say for shortness, exhibitions and professorships. It is easy to make "general observations" of this kind, and the only difficulty lies in reducing them to practice. We must, however, give due praise to the Commissioners for having resisted the temptation to discourse on this and other inviting topics in their actual Report. They have not, like other Commissioners and compilers of Blue Books who could be mentioned, taken occasion to print and publish essays on things in general at the national expense. We find in the Appendix a quantity of papers detailing the steps taken by the University of Cambridge to provide lectures and examinations for certain large towns which applied to it for assistance. This interesting and laudable enterprise appears to us to be a matter with which the Commissioners have nothing whatever to do, unless they could be considered bound to receive from Fellows of Colleges statements tending to show that these Fellows do more or less useful work for their pay, and that would open a very wide and difficult inquiry.

A memorial addressed to Mr. Gladstone sets forth the views of numerous resident members of the University of Cambridge as to the tenure of fellowships, and Mr. Gladstone states in his answer that he is pleased to find that a principle included in the Oxford University Bill of 1854 is supported by this "authoritative judgment." The next paper in the Appendix is the Report of a Committee appointed by New College, Oxford, to consider the application of its revenues. The Report, which bears date 4th June, 1873, mentions several purposes which College fellowships should serve—namely, College teaching and management, University teaching, the encouragement of education, and the encouragement of mature learning, and the Committee proceed to submit to the College a scheme for carrying these purposes into effect. These papers and others indicate anxiety to show that Colleges are sensible of their duty to make the best of their revenues for the advancement of education and learning; but they seem rather to invite the Commissioners to advance beyond their proper province. The Commissioners resisted this temptation, but it is possible that some other Commission hereafter may be less scrupulous.

The complication and variety of systems in the accounts of the Colleges renders it difficult to derive any general results from them without risk of error. The total income of the Universities and Colleges in the year 1871 is stated to have been 754,000*l.*, of which 665,000*l.* was for corporate use, and 88,000*l.* was subject to conditions of trust. It may be said roughly that, of the total income held for corporate use, the share of Oxford is to that of Cambridge as 6 to 5. The revenues arise from two different sources—first, the properties, and secondly, the room rents, dues, and fees paid by members. The former of these is called by the Commissioners external income, and the latter internal income. There is more liability to dispute or error in calculating the latter than the former. But in the case of Christ Church, Oxford, we find an item "loans raised to meet current expenditure, 9,765*l.* 5*s.* 0*d.*," added to the income from "external sources"—that is, lands, houses, &c. A hasty reader might infer that Christ Church has nearly 10,000*l.* a year more of landed property than it actually has. It must be remembered, too, that the cost of repairs, of collection of rents, and of insurance, has not generally been deducted from "external income." We must, therefore, be careful not to form hasty conclusions from the mass of valuable accounts which this Commission has collected.

THE LAW OF COMPENSATION.

MUCH attention has been and will be directed to the question whether compensation can be recovered by the sufferers in the Regent's Park explosion, and, without entering upon discussion

of the facts of that particular case, it may be useful to endeavour to ascertain the principles by which such a question must be decided. With this object we propose to refer to a case in which a Railway Company was held responsible for damage caused by fire kindled by sparks from a locomotive engine. It was conceded in that case that the defendants' engine was of the best construction, and that there was no negligence in the mode of working it, but it was contended, and the Court agreed, that the defendants were bound to take notice that such engines do emit sparks and burning cinders, and as they were driving those engines through the country in an exceptionally dry season, they ought not to have permitted combustible materials, such as hedge-trimmings, to remain on the banks of their railway. A learned judge, who went thus far with the majority of the Court, declared his own opinion that no reasonable man could have foreseen that the fire would consume a hedge and pass across a stubble-field, and so get to the plaintiff's cottage at the distance of two hundred yards from the railway, crossing a road in its passage. "It seems to me," he said, "that no duty was cast upon the defendants, in relation to the plaintiff's property, because it was not shown that that property was of such a nature and so situate that the defendants ought to have known that by permitting the hedge-trimmings to remain on the banks of the railway they placed it in undue peril." If that had been shown, then he thought that the principle of an earlier case would have applied; "for then the defendants must have been taken to have known that the course which was pursued by their servants was calculated to endanger the adjoining property."

This judgment was delivered in 1870, and we take it as fairly indicating the sort of test that would be applied to a claim by a householder in Regent's Park for compensation. Must the Canal Company be taken to have known that the course which was pursued by its servants was calculated to endanger adjoining property? Assume that the Canal Company was not only entitled, but bound, to carry gunpowder under reasonable precautions. A Railway Company is not only entitled, but bound, to drive engines through the country; and, as was said by one of the judges, "the mere circumstance of the fire being caused by an engine of the Company is not enough to give a cause of action against them, but the plaintiff must show some breach of duty on their part which occasioned the injury he complained of." The Court, said the same judge, must look at all the circumstances occurring at the time of the accident to see if there is anything to found a charge of negligence. It is clear, said another judge, that when a Railway Company is authorized by its Act of Parliament to run engines on the line, and that cannot be done without their emitting sparks, the Company is not responsible for injuries arising therefrom, unless there is some evidence of negligence on its part. Then comes the question, is there evidence in the case of a want of reasonable care? It could hardly be negligent not to provide against that which no one would anticipate. But "if the Company strewed anything very inflammable, such as, to put an extreme case, petroleum along the side of the line, they would be guilty of negligence." Another judge, in reference to the alleged dryness of the season, said, "It seems to me that the more likely the hedge was to take fire, the more incumbent it was upon the Company to take care that no inflammable material remained near it." Thus after much discussion before two Courts, and many doubts expressed by various judges, it was decided that there was evidence for the jury of negligence on the part of the defendants which caused the injury complained of. It may be generally assumed in these cases that the jury would find a verdict against the Company if the judge allowed the case to go to them.

It has been suggested that the case against the Canal Company might be put even higher than we have put it. A case came, a few years ago, before the House of Lords in which the plaintiff was the occupier of a mine under a close of land, and the defendants were the owners of a mill in his neighbourhood. They proposed to make a reservoir for storing water for their mill upon another close of land adjoining to the close of the plaintiff. Underneath the defendants' close were certain old and disused mining passages and works. The reservoir was constructed. The defendants personally took no part in the works, but they employed an engineer who did not exercise that reasonable caution which might have been exercised, taking notice, as he did, of the disused passages and works. The reservoir was filled; the weight of the water forced it through these passages, and it passed into the workings under the plaintiff's close and flooded his mine. The House of Lords, in deciding this case, put aside the question of negligence, and held that if the defendants in the course of a "non-natural use of their close" injured the plaintiff they would be liable to him in damages. Bringing water into an artificially formed reservoir is here called a "non-natural use" of the close, and it is said that the defendants would make such use of it "at their own peril." There is, however, a manifest distinction between this case and that of a Canal Company carrying gunpowder as well as other goods along its canal, because that is the very thing which the Company was created and authorized to do. This distinction clearly appears from a passage in the judgment given in this case in the Exchequer Chamber, from which Court an appeal went to the House of Lords:—"There are many cases in which proof of negligence is essential, as, for instance, where an unruly horse gets on the footpath of a public street and kills a passenger, or where a

person in a dock is struck by the falling of a bale of cotton which the defendant's servants are lowering. But we think these cases distinguishable from the present. Traffic on the highways, whether by land or sea, cannot be conducted without exposing those whose persons or property are near to it to some inevitable risk; and that being so, those who go on the highway, or have their property adjacent to it, may well be held to do so subject to their taking upon themselves the risk of injury from that inevitable danger, and persons who by the license of the owner pass near to warehouses where goods are being raised or lowered certainly do so subject to the inevitable risk of accident. In neither case, therefore, can they recover without proof of want of care or skill occasioning the accident." Among "those who have their property adjacent" to a highway may be reckoned the dwellers in the Regent's Park near this canal, and it would seem to follow that they could not recover damages from the Company "without proof of want of care or skill occasioning the accident."

It must be remembered, however, that both judges and jury may, if they please, take the view that *res ipsa loquitur*, or, in other words, that the occurrence of the accident is in itself sufficient proof of negligence. This was done not long ago in a case where a brick fell from a wall supporting an iron girder-bridge, and struck a man who was passing along the street beneath, and no explanation was given of the occurrence, nor was it easy to invent any. The Court of Queen's Bench decided by two judges against one that there was evidence for the jury, and the jury had of course found for the plaintiff. In some of the early cases against Railway Companies it was said that the fact of collision was in itself evidence of negligence, but that has been qualified in recent years. Referring again to the case of the water passing from the defendant's reservoir to the plaintiff's mine, we find it said in the Exchequer Chamber that "the true rule of law is, that the person who for his own purposes brings on his lands, and collects and keeps there anything likely to do mischief if it escapes, must keep it in at his peril, and if he does not do so is *prima facie* answerable for all the damage which is the natural consequence of its escape. . . . The person whose grass or corn is eaten down by the escaping cattle of his neighbour, or whose mine is flooded by the water from his neighbour's reservoir, or whose cellar is invaded by the filth of his neighbour's privy, or whose habitation is made unhealthy by the fumes and noisome vapours of his neighbour's alkali works, is damaged without any fault of his own; and it seems but reasonable and just that the neighbour, who has brought something on his own property which was not naturally there, harmless to others so long as it is confined to his own property, but which he knows to be mischievous if it gets on his neighbour's, should be obliged to make good the damage which ensues if he does not succeed in confining it to his own property." It has been suggested that this reasoning is applicable to the case of bringing upon land or water gunpowder which it is known will be mischievous to adjoining land if it explodes. But in all the instances given by the Court there is an absence of that statutory authority to do the thing complained of which occurs in the case under consideration. We think therefore that some evidence of negligence must be given beyond the mere fact of taking gunpowder on board in order to fix liability on the Company. "Those who carry on operations dangerous to the public are bound to use all reasonable precautions—all the precautions which ordinary reason and experience might suggest to prevent the danger. It is not enough that they do what is usual if the course ordinarily pursued is imprudent and careless; for no one can claim to be excused for want of care because others are as careless as himself. On the other hand, in considering what is reasonable, it is important to consider what is usually done by persons acting in a similar business." These words, which were addressed by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn to a jury, lay down an intelligible rule. A definition of negligence given by Mr. Baron Alderson is "the omitting to do something that a reasonable man would do, or the doing something which a reasonable man would not do." In one of the cases arising out of a fire caused by an engine's spark the decision was in favour of the defendants, but only on the ground that they had taken all the precautions which science and experience could suggest to prevent the escape of sparks. If it could be shown that defendants had not only not done this, but had neglected some precaution which an Act of Parliament prescribes, the decision might be different. The Gunpowder Act of 1860 provides that fires shall not be lighted on board a vessel carrying gunpowder while the hatches are open, and if a vessel has no deck, and therefore no hatches, the Act would seem to prohibit fires altogether. The Act also forbids smoking on board vessels carrying powder, but if the crew smoked in violation of an express prohibition by the Company, it might be questionable whether the Company could be responsible, even supposing it to be shown that smoking caused the explosion. The facts as to character and stowage of cargo may be very material on the question whether the conduct of the defendants was reasonable and prudent. But it would be premature to discuss the facts of the case at present.

DANCING LICENCES.

IT cannot be said that the Middlesex magistrates, when engaged in considering applications for music and dancing licences, present a particularly dignified or edifying spectacle. Indeed it is impossible to imagine anything more anomalous or absurd than the way

in which these things are at present managed. If the decisions of the magistrates on the various cases were left to be determined by the simple plan of heads and tails, much time would be saved, a number of worthy gentlemen would be relieved from a rather ridiculous position, and the result, as far as public interests are concerned, would be much the same as now. It is obviously very important that music-halls, dancing-saloons, and suchlike places should be placed under strict and uniform supervision; but it is evident that this is not secured under the present system. In the first place, the tribunal which has to decide these questions is not always the same, and has no fixed rules or principles of action. Sometimes there is a large muster of magistrates, and sometimes a small muster, and the majority varies from year to year in its view of the necessity of strict regulation for public amusements. One of the peculiarities of the British public is a tendency to alternate hot and cold fits of morality or prudery; and the magistrates are naturally under the influence of these changes of temperature. One year they are very severe, and sniff scandal in every kind of entertainment; but by the time that next October comes round they are in an indulgent mood and ready to license almost anything. In an ordinary way, local magistrates are no doubt capable enough of disposing of licensing applications, because they are usually well acquainted with the neighbourhood and know its wants and peculiarities. But here we have a large body of respectable middle-aged gentlemen called upon to adjudicate on the relative decency of Cremorne Gardens and the Argyll Rooms, about which, we are bound to assume, they personally know nothing whatever. This is a reflection which seems to have occurred to some of the magistrates themselves, for we find that two of them, Mr. Alderman Figgins and the Hon. C. Butler, felt it to be their duty to visit the Argyll Rooms, and appear to have been charmed by the reception they met with. The Alderman stated that "from the nature of the establishment, whatever imperfections it might have, it was impossible that it could be better conducted;" but it is possible that he may have studied the "imperfections" under favourable circumstances. The Hon. C. Butler took a higher view of this valuable institution, and hoped that the people might be weaned "from the brutality of man-kicking and woman-beating, and give way to the more generous strains of music and dancing." It is probable that this testimony may have influenced the Court in granting a licence, but it is dreadful to think of what might be the consequence if the magistrates of Middlesex generally were to deem it necessary to prosecute their researches in this earnest manner. As it is, they sit and hear evidence which, as a rule, is not of the slightest assistance to them. In the case of a tavern at Hornsey, the police stated that they had found "young couples of both sexes in the arbours in the garden, caressing each other." This was of course a clear enough case, and the licence was promptly refused. When, however, the question of Cremorne was raised, the magistrates were assured by one set of witnesses that the gardens were frequented by women of bad character, while another set of witnesses swore that they saw no improper persons at all. It is clear that, in order to test this evidence, it would have been necessary to inquire how the character of the persons in question had been ascertained. The proprietor of the Argyll Rooms declared that "all women of questionable character" were excluded; and the current reputation of the establishment would certainly lead one to suppose that the company was of a very unquestionable character indeed.

The whole subject of the regulation of places of amusement of this class is a very difficult one, but it is idle to begin by affecting any ignorance of their real character. There can be no sort of doubt that a large part of the company at all these places is very bad indeed; but it may be reasonably asked whether it is possible that this vicious element can be excluded. If it cannot be excluded it must be tolerated; but public decency must be rigorously insisted on. It may be impracticable to discover the precise shade of character of every woman who goes to a music-hall or dancing-saloon, but it is quite possible to compel the company at large, no matter how composed, to behave itself in a quiet and decorous manner, under fear of the police. If there is nothing in the entertainments and nothing in the conduct of the audience which is contrary to good order and decency, it is difficult to see what more can be asked for, or at least obtained. With regard to the character of these entertainments, the question is a comparatively simple one. A good deal of time appears to have been spent by the magistrates in inquiring into the decency of four women at the Oxford Music Hall, who appeared under the name of the "Oxford Four," and were accused by the police of being indecent in their attitudes, gestures, and dresses. It was alleged in defence that there was nothing unusual in the dances of these performers or "in their manner of retiring down the stage"; that one of them wore a dress copied exactly from a real forester's costume, "all except the boots"; and that another, who represented Charity, wore a dress which came below her boots. It was also stated that the "Oxford Four" had had their fling at the Marylebone Theatre on one occasion when the performances were under the patronage of Mr. Forsyth, M.P., and that no complaint was made by that most respectable gentleman. All this kind of evidence goes for very little, for the simple reason that it is scarcely possible to test its value. There can be no difficulty whatever in ascertaining whether there is frequent or habitual indecency in the entertainments at any place of amusement if a competent person is appointed to keep his eye on them and report any irregularities; but

loose evidence such as was brought forward in this instance settles nothing. As the magistrates granted a licence to the Oxford, with a caution to the manager to be careful in future, it must be supposed that they came to the conclusion either that there had been no serious indecorum, or that it was only a casual offence.

The case of Cremorne is a striking example of the changeable moods of the magistrates on questions of this kind. These Gardens, the character of which is well known, had been open for more than twenty years. In 1871 the magistrates suddenly discovered that the Gardens were visited by improper persons and were a public nuisance, and refused the music and dancing licences. Next year the licences were still withheld; but last year the magistrates partially relented and granted a music licence, and now they have altogether given way, and allowed both licences. All the while the proprietor has had a theatrical licence from the Chamberlain, and also one from the Excise, so that he could keep open a theatre, and sell any quantity of liquor. No objection is taken to the performances at the theatre, and it may be assumed that it is frequented by much the same sort of people as the Gardens formerly were, and again will be. If it was right that there should be no music or dancing at Cremorne for two years, no reason can be suggested why either should now be permitted. It is unnecessary to accept the glowing pictures of the attractions of this Arcadia, with its "pure fresh air," its "healthy and rational amusements," and the pleasing groups of Foresters and Druids dancing with their families and friends, which was drawn by the counsel for the proprietor. It seems that the Druids have deserted their accustomed groves, and will not go where they cannot dance; but they will now have an opportunity of returning. If public dancing is to be allowed anywhere, it would seem that it might as well be practised at Cremorne as anywhere else; and the same remark applies to the fireworks and the balloon ascents, which might just as reasonably be prohibited at the Crystal Palace as at Cremorne. It can readily be understood that the existence of such a place as this is scarcely calculated to attract quiet and respectable householders to the neighbourhood; but, on the other hand, it should be observed that the houses have come since the Gardens were opened, and almost every neighbourhood has its own peculiar nuisance in one shape or another.

In almost all the cases in which people make complaints about places of amusement of this class we are disposed to believe that the complaints are well founded. There is no room for any kind of doubt as to the sort of company which resorts to such places, or as to the purposes for which they exist, and it is unnecessary to countenance any of the pretences and affectations of the proprietors. They are bad places frequented by disreputable people, and they do a great deal of harm; on the other hand, it is impossible to suppress them without at the same time interfering vexatiously with various forms of amusement which are perfectly innocent. They must be tolerated, therefore, but under stringent regulations as to order and decorum; and it would certainly be well if the supervision which is necessary were entrusted to some more competent tribunal than the local magistrates. We may admit that they acted not unreasonably under the circumstances in reversing the decisions as to Cremorne which had been in force for a couple of years; but it is not desirable that Mr. Baum's counsel should be provided with an opportunity of advertising his client's establishment as a place of "healthy and rational amusement." It may be unavoidable that such places should be allowed to remain open, but there is no reason why their real character should not be recognized.

THE GROWTH OF INCOMES IN PRUSSIA.

A WRITER in the Berlin *Deutsches Handelsblatt* has in a recent article attempted to estimate the increase that has taken place in the incomes of the several classes of the Prussian population between the years 1852 and 1873; and although he does not put forward his calculations as anything more than roughly approximative, it may be of interest to reproduce the results at which he has arrived. The period which he has chosen for his inquiry is one that has been marked by a vast increase of activity in trade throughout the entire commercial world, and consequently by a great accumulation of wealth in the principal countries of Europe and America. At its commencement the fierce revolutionary outburst of 1848 had already spent its force, order had everywhere been restored within Germany and beyond her borders, and the working classes, disabused of their delusions, had returned to plodding productive industry. In France the Second Empire was just being set up, and the people were beginning to throw themselves with energy into the development of their material resources, with the success which has since so much astonished the world. Among ourselves, the policy of free trade had for some years been definitively adopted, the effects of the railway mania of 1846 and the Irish famine had worn themselves out, and commerce and manufactures were starting forward on that career of prosperity which forms the theme of so many patriotic effusions. As regards America, the great emigration from Ireland and Germany had already attained enormous proportions, and in consequence States and cities were springing up like the castles of the Genii in the *Arabian Nights*. And at the same time the gold discoveries in California and Australia were supplying the means of

exchange which allowed of the productive employment of this vast daily accession to the working power of the Union. Further, in our own North American, Australasian, and South African colonies somewhat similar phenomena were displayed; while in India the final conquest of the Punjab had brought the entire peninsula from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin and from the Saleiman range to the Gulf of Martaban under the undisputed sway of England, and had thus permitted the Government to turn its attention to the construction of railways, roads, telegraphs, and other works of peace, and had fostered a large trade between the dependency and the home country. Lastly, the isolation of China had been broken down, and that enormous Empire was already doing a large business with the Treaty Powers in tea, silk, opium, and other articles; while a few years later Japan also was brought within the domain of commerce. Thus, as we have said, the period has been characterized by an energy and an expansion of trade unparalleled since the extraordinary outburst of enterprise which led to and followed the discovery of America. It cannot be without interest to inquire what part has been taken in this movement by Prussia. At the beginning of the period she occupied a very secondary position. Even then, it is true, she was reckoned one of the Five Great Powers, but to the ordinary observer she seemed to owe her rank to the favour of Russia and England rather than to her own inherent strength. At the end of the period she is unquestionably the foremost of European nations. Has the material improvement of her people kept pace with her wonderful political advancement?

The writer in the *Handelsblatt* to whose article we are indebted for the Prussian statistics which we proceed to quote bases his calculations on the returns of the Income-tax and the so-called class-tax (*Klassensteuer*). As we know from the experience of our own country, Income-tax returns are not always trustworthy statements of income. Still it is probable that errors from this source are reproduced year after year, and that consequently they do not seriously obscure the annual increment of income, which is all we are concerned with. The *Klassensteuer* returns give a less accurate view. This tax is only a modification of the Income-tax, being levied upon persons whose incomes are under 1,000 thalers, or 150*l.* sterling. But these persons are ranged in thirteen classes, and the tax is assessed at a uniform rate for all the members of each class. For example, all persons with incomes between 900 and 1,000 thalers pay alike 24 thalers. It will be seen that from the yield of the tax it is impossible to calculate anything more than the average income of each class. For the purpose we have in view, however, that is a sufficiently close approximation. But now we come to what is a real defect. There are certain cities, notably Berlin, where neither Income-tax nor class-tax is levied, the places of these imposts being taken by the grist and the slaughterers' taxes (*Mahl- und Schlachtsteuer*). For these cities there exist no returns, and consequently the writer in the *Handelsblatt* has had to supply their place by conjectural estimates, of the soundness of which we have no means of judging. Lastly, in the annexed provinces, Hanover, Schleswig-Holstein, Hesse, and Nassau, Income-tax was not imposed before 1866. Accordingly for these also, so far as regards the beginning of the period, conjecture has to take the place of official returns. The estimate then is at the best no more than a very rough approximation, but even as such it will be found, we think, both interesting and instructive.

We should have liked to compare our own statistics with those here supplied, but from what we have said this, it will be seen, is only partially possible. The Prussian *Klassensteuer*, for instance, is assessed on incomes as low as sixty thalers, or nine pounds sterling. The returns apply therefore to the very lowest rank of the working classes, to every person in fact who is self-supporting, from whatever source his livelihood is derived. We need not say that there is no similar tax in this country. It may, however, be noted that the entire amount assessed to property and Income-tax in England and Wales alone amounted in 1852 to 231,799,429*l.*; while, according to the estimate before us, the taxable incomes of Prussia (including the annexed provinces) amounted in the same year to no more than 180,630,000*l.* The amount actually assessed in Prussia has been increased sixty per cent. in this estimate to arrive at the real incomes, yet the taxable value of the incomes of the classes above the wage-earning in England and Wales exceeded the real value of the incomes of all classes in Prussia by more than 50,000,000*l.*, or over one-fourth. To complete the comparison it may be well perhaps to add that the population of England and Wales in 1852 was only 17,907,609, while that of Prussia was 21,120,000, or 3,212,391 greater than the English. Further, we find that the aggregate incomes of Prussia had increased in 1873 to 290,447,700*l.*, in this case 50 per cent. being added to find the real incomes, while the assessed value in England and Wales had grown in 1872 to 613,233,690*l.* In twenty years the assessed value in England and Wales had been multiplied over 2.6 times; in twenty-one years the real incomes of Prussia had increased somewhat more than 60 per cent. In other words, the increase in England had been between three and four times as rapid as in Prussia. Further, the population of Prussia in December 1871 was 24,693,487; in April of the same year that of England and Wales was 22,711,266. The rate of increase in England was, therefore, 27 per cent.; in Prussia, 17 per cent. Whether we regard population or wealth, then, it will be seen that England is growing much more rapidly than Prussia. Again, incomes in Prussia had increased 60 per cent. against an increase of only 17 per cent. in population; in England, the annual value of the in-

comes of the propertied, trading, and professional classes increased over 160 per cent. against an increase of 27 per cent. in population. Thus it will be seen that the growth of incomes in Prussia was at a rate relatively about three and a-half times more rapid than that of population. In England the growth of property liable to Income-tax was just six times more rapid than population. Lastly, it will be seen that, whereas Income-tax paying property in England and Wales exceeded the sum of all the real incomes of Prussia in 1852 by considerably less than one-third, it is at present considerably more than twice the sum of all such incomes. In one of his election speeches last February Mr. Disraeli pointed to the multiplying productiveness of the Income-tax as one of the great sources of the prestige of this country. In the figures we have just been citing we have proof that he was not speaking without book. At the time of the *Coup d'état*, as we have just seen, the fund upon which England had to draw within her own borders exceeded the fund on which Prussia had to draw but little over one-fourth; it exceeds it now twice over, and this though Prussia goes down to the very lowest of her population, while England stops short almost altogether of her working classes.

Confining our attention now to Prussia, we find that 7,963,535 persons—about one-third of the whole population—were assessed to these taxes in 1873. The fact affords proof both of the wide distribution of property among the masses, and of the almost universality with which those able to work are productively employed. Another fact, which shows equally clearly the very moderate means of the people generally, is that 7,840,251 persons were assessed to the *Klassensteuer*—that is to say, were in receipt of incomes assessed under 150*l.* sterling, while no more than 123,284 persons were assessed at higher incomes. For one assessed at 150*l.* a year and upwards, that is, there were last year close upon 64 assessed at less; and, further, there were over 5,000,000 whose incomes were assessed at 9*l.*; or, adding 50 per cent. to find the real income, considerably more than five-eighths of the income-receiving population were in receipt of 13*l.* 10*s.* per annum, or less. On the other hand, 58 were assessed at incomes exceeding 15,000*l.* a year; and as many as 22 were assessed at 36,000*l.* a year, and over. This latter is the highest limit. Again, if the whole of the incomes had been thrown into hotchpotch, and equally divided, each income owner would have received 13*l.* 14*s.* in 1852; in 1873, 18*l.* 16*s.*, which gives an increase of 37 per cent. We have seen above that, comparing the sum of all the incomes in 1852 and 1873, the increase is about 60 per cent., but from what we have just been saying it will be seen that the increase in the very small incomes is considerably less. Indeed, for the first seven classes assessed to the *Klassensteuer*, that is, for about seven-eighths of all the income-owners of the kingdom, the increase is only 44 per cent., and as we go down to the bottom of the scale the increase becomes smaller still. On the other hand, the increase in the great incomes was over 500 per cent., and the increase in the number of persons with large incomes is equally remarkable. For example, in 1852 there were but six persons assessed at incomes between 15,000*l.* and 36,000*l.*, and but one over the latter amount. In 1866 the numbers respectively were still only eleven and three. But in 1873 thirty-four were assessed between 15,000*l.* and 36,000*l.*, and eighteen over the latter amount. In seven years, therefore, the numbers had been multiplied three times and six times respectively. The explanation suggested is that the rapid growth of these large incomes is the consequence of the enormous loans recently raised by so many Governments, not the fruit of legitimate trade. As for the great mass of the people, the reader will by this time be prepared for the conclusion arrived at by the writer from whom we have been quoting—namely, that the improvement in their condition is more nominal than real. Bearing in mind the extraordinary rise of prices, due in the first place to the gold discoveries, and in the second to the local influence of the enormous influx of money caused by the payment of the French indemnity, he is of opinion that the increase of income which has taken place does little more than prevent deterioration.

THE CESAREWITCH AND MIDDLE PARK PLATE.

THE small number of acceptances for the Cesarewitch was probably due more to the general unpopularity of long races, and to the scarcity of animals with any pretensions to compass a two-mile-and-a-quarter course, than to any feeling of dissatisfaction with the handicapper's workmanship. The old horses had plenty of chances given to them. Shannon, 6 yrs., 8 st., and Louise Victoria, 5 yrs., 7 st. 7 lbs., had certainly no reason to complain of their weights; and even so distinguished a mare as Marie Stuart was not burdened with more than 8 st. 12 lbs., which, though a heavy, cannot be considered a crushing, impost for a first-class four-year-old. If there was any error in the handicapping, it was an error of leniency, not of severity. When it was seen that Mornington, a six-year-old, was let in with no more than 7 st. 3 lbs., it was obvious to the most inexperienced that, if he were the Mornington who carried off the City and Suburban and Great Metropolitan, the Cesarewitch was a gift to him. On the other hand, it was asserted that the handicapper would never have turned him loose into the race had he not felt assured that he was not sound enough to stand another preparation. But if weights are to be apportioned, not according to the form shown in recent public performances, but according to rumours or private information about the strength or weakness of

a horse's legs, evidently their apportionment becomes a mere matter of haphazard. If the handicapper made sure that Mornington would break down, he might as well have given him the lowest weight, 5 st. 7 lbs., as 7 st. 3 lbs., for he would have broken down equally in either case. As it turned out, Mornington did actually break down, and so must have lost the race whatever had been his weight; but he did not break down till the very last moment. He stood his preparation, he did his work in a manner that entirely satisfied his friends, he arrived at Newmarket fit and well, and he started first favourite. The ground being in the most perfect condition for racing, neither too hard nor too holding, the odds were that, having stood on his legs through an unusually dry season, he would be able to stand up for five minutes more. But, those last five minutes proved fatal to Mornington. He broke down in the middle of the race when he was going, to use a common expression, like great guns, and his racing career has ended. The proverbial good luck of the handicapper has again attended him, and saved him from the annoyance of seeing his workmanship spoiled by the runaway victory of a turned loose six-year-old; but, nevertheless, we must repeat that the principle on which Mornington's impost was apportioned seems to us altogether erroneous. That a six-year-old like Shannon should be admitted into the race at the comparatively lenient weight of 8 st. was quite intelligible, for the daughter of Lambton and The Mersey has given public proofs of a gradual deterioration in form since her memorable victory in the Goodwood Cup. But there was no public proof that Mornington had lost his form.

The twenty-five runners that came to the post on Tuesday last were not, on the whole, of superior quality. The leading favourite at the close was a four-year-old gelding by Wamba, out of Truth, who had only 5 st. 12 lbs. to carry. Hesseldeu, another prominent favourite, had likewise no public performances to recommend him, yet the race was considered by the highest authorities a certainty for one of these two, in the event of Mornington not standing up to the end. Louise Victoria had won the Ebor Handicap last year, but nothing was known of her form this year, and it was noticed at Doncaster—where she did not run—that she was suffering from stringhalt. Shannon, as we have said, was known to have deteriorated, The Pique ran very badly at the First October Meeting, and the few good sound horses among the twenty-five, such as Scamp, Eole II., and Royal George, were not particularly favoured in the weights. Royal George, for instance, had to give the Truth gelding 27 lbs., and Scamp gave him 26 lbs. and a year. The twenty-five were weighed out and despatched to the post with the punctuality that always prevails at Newmarket, but we cannot help remarking on the inconvenience of fixing a great race on an October afternoon at so late an hour as four o'clock, or a few minutes before. Last Tuesday was a most brilliant autumn day, but even on the finest day at this season of the year the light grows dim before four in the afternoon, and it becomes difficult to distinguish colours at a distance. Darkness came on even earlier than usual last Tuesday afternoon, and by a spectator stationed in the neighbourhood of the winning-post nothing whatever could be made out of the position of the horses until they had got to the Bushes, or within a quarter of a mile of the finish. At that point the red and yellow of Mornington were looked for in vain; Hesseldeu was seen to be hopelessly beaten, and to be rolling about from side to side; the scarlet of Louise Victoria was discernible in the extreme rear; and Eole II., after a gallant attempt to maintain the forward position he was then occupying, was compelled to succumb. Royal George was going well at that time, as was also the German horse Gamecock; but a horse ridden by a jockey in white jacket and red cap, whom it was difficult to identify at the moment, came out of the dip with a clear lead, closely followed by Royal George's stable companion Aventurière. Thenceforward the race was a match between this pair; and the finish up the hill was finely contested between them. The unknown horse turned out to be the Truth gelding, who was ridden in wrong colours, and as he went up the hill Aventurière gained on him inch by inch, and running with the greatest gameness she just got her head in front in the last stride, and won literally on the post. The defeat of the Truth gelding was a heavy blow to his backers, especially as he was carrying 3 lbs. overweight; and according to all the rules of racing, if those 3 lbs. had been taken off, the head would have been the other way. The victory of Aventurière was a surprise, though it must be admitted that Lord Ailesbury's mare has recently exhibited a great improvement on her Spring form. It is believed that when she and Royal George were tried together the horse won, but by so little that they were fully expected to finish close together in the Cesarewitch. The mare, however, beat her stable companion very decisively in the race; but it strikes us that, had Royal George been ridden out for a place, he might possibly have obtained one. Aventurière owes her victory to the unflinching gameness with which she wore down her lightly-weighted opponent, the Truth gelding, and to the able riding of Glover, who has had the most extraordinary good fortune in winning the big handicap races of this season. He had already won the Great Metropolitan, the Chester Cup, the Goodwood and Brighton Stakes, the Lewes Handicap, and the October Handicap, and now the Cesarewitch is added to the list of his victories. We need only add that the German horse Gamecock figured very creditably in the race, and finished third, Peut-Etre being returned as fourth, Tichborne fifth, and Royal George sixth. The unfortunate Mornington walked in with the crowd.

On Wednesday a large and brilliant field of twenty-four met to

contest the greatest two-year-old prize of the racing season. The public performers included Galopin, the winner of the Hyde Park Plate at Epsom, and the Fern Hill and New Stakes at Ascot, Holy Friar, who had won every race in which he had taken part, Telescope, winner of the Lavant Stakes at Goodwood, Balie, winner of the Chesterfield and Hopeful Stakes, Dreadnought, Horse Chestnut and Chaplet. Among the dark horses were Plebeian, Per Se, a daughter of Hermit and Perseverance, Punch, the representative of the formidable French stable, and the Make-shift colt, the representative of Mr. Merry. The field also included Stray Shot, Woodlands, Maud Victoria, and The Fakenham Ghost. By many the race was looked upon as another match between the North and South of England, with Holy Friar and Galopin to fight the battle. Their public credentials were certainly undeniable, and Holy Friar, in particular, had beaten Camballo—a really good horse—so easily at Doncaster that his claims to support seemed the superior, especially as he was receiving 4 lbs. from Galopin. Of the dark horses Per Se was most talked about, and it was reported that she had won an extraordinary trial; while at the very last moment Woodlands, who won two small races at Goodwood and Brighton, was elevated to the rank of second favourite. Most of the leading competitors, with the exception of Galopin and Telescope, were saddled in the birdcage, where they attracted the usual attention. The three most liked were Holy Friar, Per Se, and Plebeian, the latter of whom quite belies his name and his unfashionable breeding; and the one least liked was Punch, who is a great leggy horse. The race had been prudently fixed for three o'clock, an hour earlier than the Cesarewitch, for, with so large a field of young horses, considerable delay at the post might have been expected. On the whole, however, they were very well behaved, and after two or three breaks away the starter was enabled to catch them in time and to drop his flag. The light also being favourable, it was possible to see the progress of the race almost from its commencement. A distinguishing feature of the contest was that there was hardly any tailing off, and even at that critical point, the Abingdon bottom, there were seven or eight horses all going well. Holy Friar, on the judge's side of the course, held perhaps a slight lead as they began the ascent, while Galopin, just under the rails on the opposite side, seemed his most formidable opponent. The latter was then joined by Plebeian and Per Se, and these three ran locked together on one side, while Holy Friar, separated from them by almost the width of the course, pursued his journey. So easily did he appear to be winning, that his jockey never really called upon him till in the last few strides, when he seemed suddenly aware of the dangerous opposition on the other side of the course. Still Holy Friar had so much in hand that both his jockey and the majority of the spectators felt assured of his success, and great was the consternation of his supporters when, on the numbers going up, it was seen that he was not in the first three. The judge's verdict was that Plebeian had won by a head; that a head separated the winner from Per Se, who was placed second; that there was another head between Per Se and Galopin, who was placed third; and yet another head between Galopin and Holy Friar, to whom was awarded the fourth place. As we have often had occasion to remark, Newmarket courses are most puzzling, not only to spectators, but to jockeys also; and it frequently happens that the public think one horse has won, the jockey is convinced of the success of a second, and the judge differs from both. At Newmarket we are satisfied that no one can really judge except the judge himself; and therefore we are always quite satisfied with the correctness of the judge's award. At the same time we feel convinced that the defeat of Holy Friar was purely accidental, and that he might have won easily had not his rider, than whom there is not a more upright or more skilful jockey in England, thought victory so certain that he was unwilling to call upon his horse for any extra exertions. We may add, in connexion with the Middle Park Plate, that the four leaders were well clear of the remainder of the field, at the head of which came Punch and Horse Chestnut, the latter of whom ran well in front for a considerable portion of the distance, but could not stay. Galopin, who was conceding the winner 7 lbs., proved himself a great horse, and as he was slightly disappointed at the finish, we may make bold to believe that Holy Friar and he, if all had gone well, would have occupied the first and second places at the finish. We have no wish, however, to detract from the merits of Plebeian, the uncommonly good-looking brother to Chawbacon, or of Per Se, who all but revived the glories of the once famous Danebury stable.

REVIEWS.

LIFE OF LORD PALMERSTON.*

THE long and accurate title-page of the second volume of the Life of Lord Palmerston indicates the process by which a fragmentary compilation has been prepared for publication. Lord Dalling had apparently exhausted his scanty materials in papers which remained at his death in a confused and unfinished state.

* *The Life of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston; with Selections from his Correspondence.* By the late Right Honourable Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer (Lord Dalling). Edited by the Honourable Evelyn Ashley, M.P. Vol. II. London: Bentley & Son.

Mr. Ashley has arranged the documents in proper order, and he has added a few of Lord Palmerston's letters with the smallest possible thread of connecting statement. The biography, as it is called, ends with the year 1847, some time before Lord Palmerston's domestic career as a statesman had even begun. Mr. Ashley would have added to the obligation which he has conferred on Lord Dalling's readers if he had found time to supply the broken narrative with an index, a table of contents, or even a notice inserted from time to time of the points at which Lord Dalling's composition begins or ends. Mr. Ashley may probably possess ability as an original writer, but, if he disdains the modest function of an editor, he would have done better to entrust the task to less ambitious and more careful hands. Although the book is not a biography of Lord Palmerston, it possesses considerable value. The detailed part of the story relating entirely to Spanish politics is related by a confidential and zealous agent, who at the same time admires his principal and severely criticizes his instructions. Lord Dalling, more or less unconsciously, wrote a fragment of autobiography in the form of a *Life of Lord Palmerston*. He seems to have known but little of any of Lord Palmerston's transactions with which he was not personally connected; but the details of a single diplomatic correspondence probably illustrate the character of a statesman as fully as the most comprehensive summary of his general policy. The letters to Sir W. Temple which are published by Mr. Ashley are highly interesting. The popular estimate of Lord Palmerston's frank, cheerful, and manly character is fully confirmed by the specimens which are published of his private correspondence.

The unsavoury history of the Spanish marriages has lately been revived on the occasion of M. Guizot's death. The sanctimonious designer and instrument of the crime had long before published all the French details of the successful intrigue which has covered him with indelible disgrace. The diplomatic proceedings of Lord Palmerston and of Mr. Bulwer, then English Minister at Madrid, are now for the first time fully known. Even if King Louis Philippe and M. Guizot had enjoyed no other advantage in the contest, their chance of winning the game was greatly increased by the unity of purpose which regulated French trickery at Paris and at Madrid. The Minister, though he had little love for his Sovereign, was deeply interested in the accomplishment of a family plot which seemed also to involve a national triumph. Both were served at Madrid by an unscrupulous agent in the person of Count Bresson, who, in the opinion both of Lord Palmerston and Mr. Bulwer, was deficient in the qualities of a gentleman. On the other hand, Mr. Bulwer's exertions were from first to last disapproved and thwarted by Lord Palmerston, who, if his representative and friendly biographer is in the right, perpetrated from the moment when he undertook the conduct of the negotiation an uninterrupted series of blunders. It is remarkable that M. Guizot never even understood the wishes of Lord Palmerston, although he well knew that the English Government was irreconcilably opposed to the scandalous choice of Don Francisco as the husband of the Queen. While Mr. Bulwer was eager to accept the overtures of Queen Christina for a marriage with Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg, Lord Palmerston preferred the younger brother of Francisco, Prince Henry, who was two or three years ago killed by the Duke of Montpensier in a duel. It is possible that Lord Palmerston may have been justified in his suspicion that the language used by the Queen Regent and her Moderado Ministers in their communications with Mr. Bulwer was intended as a trap, for the purpose of providing the King of the French with an excuse for forcing on the marriage with Don Francisco, by which it was hoped that the ultimate succession would be secured to the descendants of the Duke of Montpensier. On the other hand, it was necessary to incur some risk, and, although it would have been absurd to trust a Spanish Court or its agents, there was some reason to believe that Queen Christina might desire to save her daughter from the misery and ruin which were prepared for her by her great-uncle and by the pious Guizot. That the Regent would prefer her own interests to the welfare of Queen Isabella was certain even before it was proved by the result; but she would have been supported by the unanimous feeling of the Spanish nation if she had defeated the French plot by concluding the marriage with Saxe Coburg. Prince Henry was politically allied with the Progressist Opposition, and he was the personal enemy of Christina. With Saxe Coburg she had formed a friendly connexion; Don Francisco was a nullity in politics; but the accession of Don Henry to the rank of titular king would have probably caused her exile. Mr. Bulwer always retained his belief that the Queen had been sincere in her offers; and he justly censures Lord Palmerston's determination to ally himself with the Opposition rather than with the Ministers who had the power of deciding the fate of the struggle. Lord Palmerston was perhaps influenced by the advice of Lord Clarendon, who during his long residence in Spain had been himself the virtual head of the Progressist party. As Lord Palmerston was at all times averse to the modern doctrine of non-intervention, the system of identifying English policy with the supremacy of one party in Spain would in ordinary cases have been intelligible, if not judicious; but in a contest which was to be decided in a few weeks or days it was a mistake to play a waiting game. Although M. Guizot misunderstood his opponent's immediate object, his belief that Lord Palmerston was busily engaged in counteracting the efforts of France was perfectly well founded. Queen Christina was urged to agree to the marriage with Francisco on the assumption that England was pressing the claims of Saxe Coburg, and the Queen ultimately gave way because Lord Palmerston threatened her

with the selection of her enemy Prince Henry. M. Guizot was lucky in the change of Ministry in England during the summer of 1846. He would probably in any case have hunted down the poor girl who was his destined victim; but an avowed breach of faith to a confiding and generous friend would have been more embarrassing than a deception practised on an adversary who never concealed his just appreciation of the austere French Minister's character. Upright, timid, and credulous, Lord Aberdeen, if he was not a vigorous diplomatist, was a perfect gentleman. Implicitly relying on M. Guizot's promises that he would act in concert with England, he erroneously thought himself bound to communicate to the French Government Queen Christina's overtures for a Saxe-Coburg marriage transmitted through Mr. Bulwer. It would have been difficult for the most virtuous of intriguers to find in Lord Aberdeen's unbounded confidence a pretext for deceit. Lord Aberdeen had made more than one weak and injudicious concession, but he trusted in the explicit promise of the French King and his Minister that the Montpensier marriage with Donna Carlotta, if it were not abandoned, should be postponed until the Queen had children. When M. Guizot insolently insisted on the condition that the Queen of Spain should marry a prince of the House of Bourbon, Lord Aberdeen abstained from protesting against the French pretension, although he never explicitly admitted it. His silence and the pretended support of Saxe-Coburg by his successor were afterwards made the excuse for the perfidious policy of which M. Guizot was proud. If Lord Aberdeen had remained in office, it would have become necessary to commit an open and unqualified act of bad faith. When Mr. Bulwer was shortly afterwards sent out of Spain by General Narvaez, he, according to his own statement, explained his conduct to the full satisfaction of Lord Aberdeen and Sir Robert Peel; and it is certain that Sir Robert Peel discountenanced and prevented any disapproval which might have been expressed in the House of Commons. Lord Palmerston proposed to answer the affront by the despatch of an English fleet to Cadiz, but he was overruled by colleagues who at all times feared and distrusted his vigorous policy.

The Spanish disputes which filled a great part in the diplomatic career of Lord Dalling were only an episode in the life of Lord Palmerston. It is to be hoped that at some future time a competent biographer will fill up the blanks which at present occupy the greater part of the space allotted to his life. During his long administration of the Foreign Office he steadily adhered to the principle of insisting against all Powers, great or small, on the rights of England. He disapproved of the large concessions made by Lord Aberdeen through Lord Ashburton to the United States, not so much for the sake of the territory actually surrendered as on the ground that concessions made to an overbearing adversary inevitably invite further aggression. The opposite policy of Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues immediately produced the Indirect Claims, and resulted in the iniquitous Geneva Award; and as a further consequence every European Power is now convinced that no encroachment will provoke resistance on the part of England. No European war occurred in Lord Palmerston's time, unless the petty Syrian campaign of 1840 deserves the name, as having arisen from a conflict of English and French policy. Lord Dalling attributes the Crimean War to the impression produced on the mind of the Emperor Nicholas by the acquiescence of the English Government in the insult offered to it by Narvaez. It is more certain that the submissive attitude of Lord Aberdeen and an erroneous belief in Mr. Cobden's influence were the determining causes of the policy of Russia. When Mr. Gladstone moved for a grant of money to take the Guards to Malta and back again, the confidence of Russia in the patience or cowardice of England was irretrievably confirmed. At a much earlier period, during the short Conservative Ministry of 1834 and 1835, Lord Palmerston bore witness to the more resolute policy of a political adversary, extremely unlike Lord Aberdeen:—

I suspect [he told his brother] that the Duke is, if possible, more hostile to Russia than I was, fully as much impressed with the necessity of checking her insatiable ambition, and quite as determined to employ the means which England possesses to do so. The fact is that Russia is a great humbug, and that if England were fairly to go to work with her we should throw her back half a century in one campaign. But Nicholas, the proud and insolent, knows this, and will always check his pride and moderate his insolence when he finds that England is firmly determined and fully prepared to resist him.

There are probably still a few survivors of a crazy little sect which thirty years ago taught as its central doctrine that Lord Palmerston was the docile tool and hired agent of Russia. It seems that even in his secret confidential letters he prudently retained the mask of patriotism. It is a pleasant change from diplomacy to hear in his letters to Sir W. Temple of his modest winnings on the turf, of his hunting and shooting, of his plantations at Broadlands, and of the Methodist gardener whose preaching he intends, if possible, to stop. He enjoyed the official holiday which resulted from the accession of the Conservative Ministry in 1841, especially because he entertained no doubt that he should return to power after a longer or shorter interval. Yet at that time, and for several years afterwards, he stood apart from the Whigs, with whom he was neither connected by family nor united by early political associations. The distrust of the party was indicated by Lord Grey's refusal to join the proposed Ministry of Lord John Russell in 1845; and although Lord Palmerston's ability and reputation made him indispensable to the Government which was formed in the following summer, the latent dislike found unexpected expression in his peremptory dismissal by Lord John

Russell in 1851. By that time Lord Palmerston had, to the unbounded surprise of the veteran Whig leader, become the favourite of the party. Within two months from his own fall he overthrew the Government, and after a short interval he established himself for life as the chief of the Liberals. It is said that he accurately foretold the fall of the uncongenial colleague who was during his term of office evidently destined to be his successor.

One of the most interesting letters published by Mr. Ashley, and addressed in 1842 to Lord John Russell, contains a bitter attack on one of the chief representatives of that section of the Whig party which systematically opposed Lord Palmerston's policy. Mr. Ellice had been an active and even restless member of the party when Lord Palmerston held office in a Tory Government, and when the Whigs, under the guidance of his brother-in-law, Lord Grey, opposed the war which was conducted by the successors of Pitt. When Lord Grey became Minister, Mr. Ellice, as Political Secretary of the Treasury, was the principal manager of the personal arrangements and minor negotiations which facilitated the passage of the Reform Bill. In 1834 he retired finally from office, after sitting for a short time in Lord Melbourne's Cabinet, and, with a large acquaintance and an ample fortune, he amused his leisure with the exchange of oral and written correspondence with English and foreign politicians. In his old age his busy idleness mellowed into agreeable gossip, seasoned by anecdotes of his long political experience. While he still exercised influence in public affairs both as a sagacious member of the House of Commons and in general society, his opposition to any active statesman might reasonably cause irritation or fear according to the character of his adversary. He never trusted Lord Palmerston nor approved his policy, and his dislike was fully returned. His criticisms were the more obnoxious because he lived much at Paris and in the society of the French statesmen whose intrigues furnished Lord Palmerston with incessant occupation. The letter to Lord John Russell was perhaps intended to convey an answer and a warning to other members of the party as well as to Mr. Ellice. He says that

E—set out in the days of Durham's ambition to endeavour to turn me out of the Foreign Office in order to get Durham in; and well punished he was for his treachery by the bitter disappointment which he felt at its failure. He was furious, and has never forgiven me, and, despite his wish to be cautious, he even now from time to time exhales his wrath by swearing on his honour that I shall never return to that office in the event of our party regaining power. I am not, however, much moved to anger by this hostility, because, thank Heaven, I know I am a stronger man than he is, and he knows that too, which does not make him love me the better.

It happens that Mr. Ellice often spoke of Lord Palmerston's strength as his distinguishing quality. There was no reason why a Whig politician who, like many others of the same party, failed to appreciate the soundness of Lord Palmerston's policy should not exert himself to prevent his return to office. Only three years after the date of the letter Lord Grey, a statesman incapable of intrigue, made the exclusion of Lord Palmerston from the Foreign Department the condition of his own acceptance of office. It seems that Lord John Russell had told Lord Palmerston that some of the Whigs and Radicals were disposed to take their views of foreign relations from Mr. Ellice. Lord Palmerston was right in his assertion of his own superiority of judgment, though not in his contemptuous tone. It is difficult to understand how Mr. Ellice's difference of opinion involved any moral delinquency. In another part of the same letter Lord Palmerston contrasts his own laborious attention to foreign affairs during ten years with Mr. Ellice's alleged employment of the same time "in gossiping and caballing in clubs and drawing rooms and country houses." He was fully justified in attributing to himself superior knowledge of his own proper business; but if a veteran Foreign Minister is never to be criticized except by those who are his equals in practical knowledge, he must be absolutely irresponsible. In the same spirit and with as little reason poets and painters complain of the independent judgment of critics; and cooks probably resent the complaints of employers who could themselves scarcely broil a mutton chop. It was not in Lord Palmerston's nature to be either intolerant or excessively sensitive; but he evidently took the opportunity of a special attack on a single opponent to defend himself against the censures in which Lord John Russell himself may sometimes have concurred. On the whole, the present fragment or sample of a biography tends to raise the character of Lord Palmerston.

THE CHURCH OF THE REVOLUTION.*

DR. STOUGHTON has followed up his volumes on *The Church of the Restoration* by his present work on the history of the English Church and of the Nonconformist bodies which then began to assume a separate organization of their own, from the expulsion of James II. to the death of William III. He is not without hope that he may one day be enabled to trace the consequences of the events he relates "through a careful study of the great religious movements of the eighteenth century" (p. 460). In regard to the instalment of his design which he now submits to the public, "I venture to add," he says, "that in this, as in my former volumes, I have endeavoured to maintain an honest impartiality in the estimate of characters and incidents, together with a firm attachment to my own religious and eccle-

siastical principles." We have no reason to complain of his having failed in either of these purposes, so far at least as they are capable of being reconciled. Dr. Stoughton's views on Church affairs are always those of a sturdy Dissenter of the Congregational denomination, but they are held and expressed in a spirit and language as different as can be imagined from that which passes current for truth and charity in the writings and speeches of the more prominent members of the so-called Liberation Society. Since he tells us that he has assigned a large space in this volume to the attempt at Comprehension in the year 1689, "as it is a subject of present interest, and because the proceedings connected with it have been but inadequately described," we are almost driven to the conclusion that he believes that a like plan of comprehension, whereby moderate Nonconformists may find themselves able to hold public communion with the English Church, is growing ripe for discussion, and may in some shape or other become one of the practical questions of the day. Sorry as we are to say so, we are fully convinced that the expectation (if, indeed, he cherishes it) is utterly chimerical, and, even though it could be realized in outward form, would disappoint the most sorely those who had been foremost in promoting it. But that temperate estimate of the actions and motives of persons with whom we have little in common, which renders Dr. Stoughton's pleasant, if rather superficial, narrative so profitable to read and digest, may be imitated by all of us to our very great profit. His wise reserve in passing judgment, his willingness to think the best even of Non-jurors and high prerogative men, his earnest desire to deal fairly with every subject that passes under his view, are qualities by no means so common as they ought to be; and since Dissenters are sure to study this part of our Church history, of which we have on the whole no great reason to be proud, we are quite content that they should do so under the guidance of one so intelligent, so calm, so unfeignedly truth-loving as our author.

The scheme of comprehension or reconciliation of Dissenters, which was formed immediately after the Revolution of 1688, proved something worse than a mere failure; it failed under circumstances which rendered all future attempts hopeless, if not impossible. We cannot assent to Dr. Stoughton's idea that this was one of the lost opportunities of history (p. 138); yet the prospect of success looked brighter then than it ever had done previously, or ever can again. There were no bitter rivalries, disappointed aspirations, keen recollections of wrongs given and received, such as had deprived the Conference at the Savoy of all good fruits. Churchman and Nonconformist had just emerged triumphantly from a struggle wherein they had shown a common front to a common foe. There were few vested interests or hard-won positions to be yielded up for the sake of peace as there would be now. The new King was more than favourable to the attempt. Himself a narrow Presbyterian, the terror of his wife's chaplains, Hooper and Covell, and even of Ken, at the Hague, he cared as much about securing for his co-religionists a share in the temporal goods of the Established Church as he cared for anything except a French war. Tillotson and Tenison, who took the lead in the enterprise (from which Burnet never augured much, though he did not refuse to help it on), were destined by the sovereign for the highest preferments he had to bestow. Yet the thirty Royal Commissioners to whom had been entrusted the preparation of the terms of comprehension for the sanction of Convocation (ten of them being Bishops, ten Deans or Archdeacons, ten from the flower of the London clergy), after holding eighteen sessions in the famous Jerusalem Chamber between October 3 and November 18, 1689, broke up without making a Report, or submitting any formal suggestion to any one. Six Commissioners never sat at all; four others had withdrawn early; on the last day it was difficult to form a quorum of nine. One cause for this *fiasco* was visible enough. Convocation had met twelve days before, and the Lower House had given full proof of its temper by electing Dr. Jane (one of the four deserters) for Prolocutor, by a majority of two to one over Tillotson. Proposals, therefore, were prudently withdrawn which were sure to have been contumeliously rejected; they were reserved for some better season, which never came.

But it is impossible to review the proceedings of the Royal Commissioners, or to study the brief abstract of their debates yet remaining to us, without perceiving that the chief obstacle to success was not opposition from without, which might perhaps be mitigated or overcome in more quiet times, but the very nature of the task which they had rashly taken in hand. It serves to show the little interest which the whole matter has excited, that the Prayer Book interleaved with their "alterations and improvements," deposited at their final meeting with Tenison, and by Bishop Gibson's directions afterwards sent to the Lambeth Library, remained almost forgotten till its contents were printed in 1854 by order of the House of Commons, although attention had been called to them in Birch's Life of Tillotson and other well-known works. The Blue-book of 1854 comprises also a diary of the proceedings of each session, kept by one of the Commissioners, Dr. John Williams, Rector of St. Mildred's, Poultry, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, from which we gather at least as much as from the annotated Prayer Book itself. From this most interesting document we learn that the point on which all these unhappy controversies with Dissenters hinge—the validity of ordination by others than by a bishop—never came under discussion before the eleventh session, and then elicited as many opinions as speakers. "The stopping of the present

* *Ecclesiastical History of England. The Church of the Revolution.* By John Stoughton, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1874.

schism made it a necessity" to acknowledge them, as Burnet put the matter bluntly and truly. Unless Churchmen were prepared to give way here, the Commission was but labour lost; yet to concede so much as a general principle would be a surrender to the enemy of the very citadel and key of the position. So "it was agreed that it should be only for this turn, those that were in Orders, but not to proceed further"; a compromise which every one must have felt sure would be rejected without hesitation by those it was designed to satisfy.

Ignominious failure in regard to the chief subject at issue did not in the least deter the Commissioners from devising expedients as to lesser things which may almost be called puerile. The Holy Communion was still to be received kneeling, but those that "scrupled kneeling" might come to the minister some week-day before and tell him so, and might then receive "in some posture of reverence, in some convenient pew or place in the church." Ministers again who objected to the use of the surplice or the sign of the Cross in baptism might go to the bishop and tell him their mind, and the bishop, as he thought fit, might appoint one to officiate in the service in the objector's room. In regard to these matters well might Beveridge tell his brethren that "there was no end if we would take away all scruples." Of the Apocryphal lessons a clean sweep was made from the Prayer Book; the Athanasian Creed was dealt with in a way that might content the reformers of the Irish Church Synod; the black-letter Saints were removed from the Calendar, and the Commissioners even stooped to expunge the title of "Saint" before the names of the Apostles whose festivals were retained. Their corrections of the Prayer Book throughout every page present us with a curious, almost revolting, example of evil diligence. Well may Dr. Stoughton be "astonished at the extent of the proposed alterations" (p. 136), even though he may not agree with us in thinking that, by a curious infelicity, almost every one was made decidedly for the worse. There sat at that Board divines of the calibre of Stillingfleet and Beveridge, real scholars like Lloyd and Patrick, but the only man who wrote tolerable English in the whole party was Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, who had retired after the second session. Hence the Collects, our glorious inheritance from the mediæval Church, were turned over to Patrick to revise, and to the slovenly gossip Burnet "to give fresh spirit to them," as is stated by Birch, whose own pen has been likened to a torpedo. That golden prayer, "O God, whose nature and property," &c., which in its English form all but rivals the condensed energy of the original in the sacramentary of Gregory the Great, was expelled partly "as strange and impertinent," partly "as it did not come in here by the authority of Convocation or Parliament"; it was simply misplaced in the book of 1686, used by the Commissioners, and in several editions of about the same date. One other out of their 598 heads of "improvements" will detain us but a moment. In the Burial Service, besides other pitiful variations, the unoffending epithet is got rid of in the clause "our dear brother here departed"; and this change, for which we can assign no reason save a very shocking one, must have commended itself to some people at the time, for we have known the same liberty taken, within the present generation, by at least one worthy clergyman of the Puritan school, now safely removed by death from all fear of penal laws. It was well that a volume which contains so much against which pure taste revolts should have lain buried till a period has arrived when we are more likely to be ashamed of its bad example than to copy it. One worthy speech of Stillingfleet's deserves to be remembered amidst so much imbecility and lack of purpose on the part of his colleagues. When "it was sometimes queried, What good would this do as to the Dissenters?" he boldly made answer that "we sat there to make such alterations as were fit, and would be fit to make were there no Dissenters, and which would be for the improvement of the Service." *O si sic omnia.*

Dr. Stoughton has good reason for saying that he has tried to be impartial in estimating character. We observe but one instance of his failure in this particular, and that is when he alleges of John Moore, Bishop of Ely, that "his love of books weakened his regard for the rights of property" (p. 303). The charge of book-stealing was first made, we believe, by Tew, in Bridge's *History of Northamptonshire* (vol. ii. p. 45), and has been ascertained to rest on no good grounds. To Archbishop Tenison he seems over-indulgent, and speaks of his intellectual powers and "rock-like firmness" in a tone to which we have not been used. Swift, we suppose, must be regarded as a prejudiced witness when he asks "by what talents that great prelate ascended so high," especially as he long afterwards appended to Macky's description of his Grace as "a plain, good, heavy man," the indignant comment, "the most good-for-nothing prelate I ever saw." Burnet's, too, is faint praise when, relating his translation from Lincoln to Canterbury, he states that Tenison "was well liked for having served the cure of St. Martin's, in the worst time, with so much courage and discretion; so that at this time he had many friends and no enemies"; but then Burnet might easily have believed himself a stronger candidate for the primacy. Yet we thought it had been understood that from being an active, learned parish priest, who had done his duty nobly in his resistance to reading King James's "Declaration of Toleration" in his church, he subsequently proved, like so many other men have done before and since, very unequal to the higher offices to which he was called. Certainly his reply to that excellent man Robert Nelson, when he entreated the Arch-

bishop's intercession with the King to spare Sir John Fenwick's life, suggests very painful reflections, whatever Dr. Stoughton may think of it (p. 240). "Laws *ex post facto* may indeed carry the face of rigour with them, but if ever [such?] a law was necessary, this is." We might grant the Primate's premises without admitting his conclusion. Laws *ex post facto* never can be necessary, because they must always do greater harm by way of setting evil precedents than they can promise good by the punishment of the guilty. The bill of attainder against Sir John Fenwick—pushed through the House of Lords by a majority of sixty-eight against sixty-one, mainly, we fear, through the votes of Tenison and his suffragans (p. 304), who ought to have withdrawn in a case of blood, has been condemned by every constitutional writer, by every one calling himself an historian except Lord Macaulay. It never will be imitated again while public order reigns in England; it never has been imitated—and even then not to the taking of life—save in the bills of pains and penalties against Bishop Atterbury and the unhappy Queen Caroline.

To the Non-jurors Dr. Stoughton is not unjust—he cannot conscientiously be so—but he is naturally unappreciating. It seems to him such folly to be ever swimming against the tide; to have frustrated the designs of James because he assailed the Church which they loved better than the throne, and then to refuse to acknowledge William because he usurped the crown which had fallen from his relative's head. He applies to those who cling to the divine right of kings when the notion had become unfashionable, language which we should have imagined Professor Jowett too generous to have uttered:—

The great crises in the history of nations have often been met by a sort of feminine positiveness and a more obstinate reassertion of principles which have lost their hold upon a nation. The fixed ideas of a reactionary statesman may be compared to madness. He grows more and more convinced of the truth of his notions as he becomes more isolated, and would rather await the inevitable than in any degree yield to circumstances.

Assuming the principles which he maintains against all odds to be in themselves important, what else has an honest man to do? Obstinacy has a bad name, but it is near akin to some of the noblest qualities of our nature—to disinterestedness, steadfastness in adversity, faithful obedience to the voice of conscience. We will not plead strongly for Sancroft, whose culpable weakness in continuing the succession, and that against his own better judgment, produced a schism which languished feebly for nearly a century; we would rest our case upon Ken. Could any nobler or more seemly ending of a saintly life be conceived than that which he led at Longleat? So far from censuring those who had taken the oaths to the new sovereigns, he had almost been persuaded to follow their example; but he feared the future reproach of his own reflections, and, without one spark of passion or one resentful thought, withdrew from wealth and dignity to poverty and that dependence which lends poverty its worst sting. We know not how Dr. Stoughton can say that his successor Kidder paid him half the income of his abandoned see (p. 305). All we learn of the confessor's temporal fortunes would serve to prove the statement a mistake, although Kidder was haunted up to his sad death in the great storm of November 27, 1703, by the terrible suspicion that he was "eating poor Dr. Ken's bread." Yet it may be that in his deep retirement the expelled Bishop was more truly useful than when lodged in his stately moated palace at Wells. It is much that in a world wherein all save the best men hold their convictions but loosely and uncertainly, one of purer mould should stand forth at critical times to prove what may be done and suffered gladly for the sake of a quiet conscience. The Marian martyr Ridley, we suspect, made more converts to his creed at the stake than did the Marian fugitive Jewell at Paul's Cross or in his well-used study.

Our author spends his five concluding chapters (and they will seem to most readers the best, as they are the most original) on the great Nonconformist divines of the Restoration period, the generation that slowly died out in William's reign, and found none fit to take their places. And here, again, we note his spirit in the character of those upon whose praises he dwells most fondly. The stiff and somewhat surly virtue of Richard Baxter has fewer charms for him than the milder and more catholic temper of Bates and Howe. The aspirations after unity among all Christian people breathed forth by the latter win his especial sympathy, as well as the sharp rebuke dealt to the able but turbulent De Foe, who, in his *Enquiry into the Occasional Conformity of Dissenters*, in 1697, had complained of those Dissenters who at times attended church as persons of "an amphibious nature, who could believe one way and worship another" (p. 431). Even though a Churchman may deem ecclesiastical order in its proper place as necessary to be maintained as charity itself, we should not think highly of the man who could regard these motions towards union (if not in outward semblance, at least in mind and spirit) with any other feelings than those of thankfulness and admiration. Comprehension, in the sense in which Tillotson or Burnet might employ the term, we believe to be visionary. It would imply on the one side or the other, probably on both, too heavy a sacrifice of what seems to each to be the truth to be either acceptable or permanent. Not thus visionary is the prospect of gentle thoughts and friendly courtesy, in such wise as Dr. Stoughton affords us a model to emulate, subsisting in time to come between those who are separated from each other either by reason of deep convictions, or through the force of circumstances which have passed into history and cannot now be recalled. More than this must be

reserved for some purer state of moral and religious feeling than appears ever likely to be realized while human nature continues what it is.

We subjoin, as a favourable specimen of the author's manner, his general estimate of the theological literature of the Revolution period, which he contrasts with that of the preceding age by the fanciful comparison of the Gothic style of Westminster Abbey with the Renaissance or classical reproduction which finds its most prominent exemplification in St. Paul's Cathedral :—

A similar change came over poetry. It were an indignity to the great bard of the seventeenth century to compare him with any other than the great bard of the sixteenth. Milton's name is linked with Shakespeare's, but in the way of contrast. . . . The poet of the Renaissance succeeds the poet of romance. And this same Renaissance spirit worked its way into theological literature. Taylor and Bunyan, indeed all the great religious writers of the Commonwealth and the Restoration, appear more or less romancers in the style of their thoughts, regarded from a literary point of view. Divisions, pointedness, quaint expression, warmth of sentiment, such as arrests us in mediæval buildings, are reproduced in the books of that picturesque age. The two authors just mentioned belong to the class of romancer prose poets. But all is changed when we turn to the theological literature of King William's days—Tillotson, Burnet, Bentley, Locke. We miss Anglican and Puritan sweep of thought, minuteness of detail, intensity of utterance, and glow of passion. There is no depth of colour, all is pale; no flash of fire, all is cold. We meet with regularity, order, smoothness. It is the age of Renaissance in Divinity.

SHERIDAN'S WORKS.*

IT may be doubted whether there was any necessity for a new edition of Sheridan's works. There are already several editions which contain everything of Sheridan's that is worth reading, and the addition of what is not worth reading is hardly calculated to make the collection more attractive to reasonable people. It is cruel as well as foolish to reproduce all the trash which an eminent man may have thrown off in days of immaturity or idleness; but the editor of the book now before us has committed a more serious offence than this. He has gone out of his way to swell the volume with matter which is not only worthless but offensive. He has raked up some translations which Sheridan, while still a lad, composed in conjunction with a schoolfellow, and which he was foolish enough to publish. It is known that the original publication was a pecuniary failure, and it may be hoped that the present wanton and inexcusable reprint will share a similar fate. The "Love Verses of Aristænetus" are unrelieved by any flavour of wit or sentiment, nor does the style of the translation rise much above the level of the doggerel of the streets. There is, in short, nothing whatever to justify the raking up of this unclean rubbish from the oblivion in which it has for many years been happily buried. It was perhaps thought, however, that the incorporation of these impurities would impart to the book a peculiar flavour which would be likely to attract the attention of that class of readers for whom the same publishers have already been good enough to provide new editions of Tom D'Urfey, the *Musarum Deliciae*, Walt Whitman ("The Complete Work," we are assured), and similar delicacies. It is possible that the titles and reputation of some of these publications may convey to most persons a sufficient warning of their character; but it is intolerable that a volume which might be introduced without suspicion to family reading should be deliberately tainted in this way. It is true that there are many things in Sheridan's plays which are coarse, and the manners of the age in which the plays were written made it natural that this should be so; but it is not of mere coarseness that we are now speaking. It is impossible to acquit the editor and publishers of this edition of Sheridan of a grave offence against literary decency. Nor do their offences, or at least the offences of the editor—for we cannot of course know how far the publishers are in this respect his confederates—stop here. Not only decency, but honesty, is outraged in this publication. We are presented with a Memoir of Sheridan, the authorship of which is not specified, but at the end of it we find the initials "F. E. S.," which we take to be those of the gentleman who on the title-page modestly calls himself editor. Mr. Stainforth may, in attaching his initials to the memoir, have meant to convey only that he has taken the responsibility of editing it; but to most persons the appearance of such a signature would suggest the idea of a claim to authorship. It has been remarked by a judicious critic that Mr. Stainforth tells us nothing new, but this is easily accounted for. In point of fact, this Memoir is composed of a series of extracts from Moore's *Life of Sheridan*, taken literally and bodily, and put together with hardly a syllable of connecting matter. Yet not a hint is given anywhere in the volume of the source of these appropriations. It may also be noted as a proof of the editor's carelessness, as well as recklessness, that we find one of the chalk drawings labelled "J. P. Kemble as Pizarro." If Mr. Stainforth had only taken the trouble to turn to the *Dramatis Personæ* given on another page, he would have learned, what we should have thought everybody knew, that Rolla was the part taken by Kemble, while Barrymore played Pizarro.

It would be manifestly unfair to subject such works as those of Sheridan to the test of a purely literary examination. It is not as an ordinary man of letters that he comes before us, but as a dramatist

and an orator. He wrote his plays in order that people might be amused by them when they were acted at the theatre, and he prepared his speeches with a view to their immediate effect upon the audiences to whom they were addressed; and he was eminently successful in making the desired impression in both cases. Two, if not three, of his plays are still among the most popular on the stage, and are continually repeated before audiences of our own day, who apparently find them as fresh and irresistible as Sheridan's own contemporaries found them when they were first produced. As for the speeches, there is good reason for believing that they were really effective at the time they were delivered. Byron is said to have declared in one of his rhapsodies that whatever Sheridan had done was always the best of its kind; that he had written the best comedy (*School for Scandal*), the best opera (the *Dianna*), the best farce (the *Critic*), and the best address (Monody on Garrick), and that, to crown all, he had delivered the very best oration (the Begum speech) ever conceived or heard in this country. There is of course a good deal of Byron's characteristic exaggeration in this assertion, for the *Dianna* is but a poor piece of work, and decidedly inferior to the *Beggar's Opera*, in imitation of which it was composed, and the Monody on Garrick is stiff and commonplace. But the *School for Scandal* and the *Critic* still remain the best pieces of their kind, in spite of the very obvious faults by which they are disfigured. The dialogue of the former is indeed somewhat blunted by being put into type, and requires the adroit emphasis of the stage to make it crackle properly; but the *Critic* is almost as amusing to read as to see acted. On every page we come upon familiar and almost proverbial passages, such as—"If it is abuse, why one is almost sure to hear of it from one d—d good-natured friend or other"; "the puff preliminary, the puff collateral, the puff collusive, and the puff oblique"; the clock that marks time at the opening of the play and "saves a description of the rising sun and a great deal about gilding the Eastern hemisphere"; "when they do agree on the stage their unanimity is wonderful"; "in a free country I'm not for making slavish distinctions and giving all the fine language to the upper sort of people"; Lord Burleigh's shake of the head, and the heroic dead-lock of uncles and nieces. It cannot be denied that Sheridan is weak in drawing character, and that the persons of his dramas are artificial types rather than actual human beings. Yet, though they may be unnatural in themselves, there are sufficient touches of human nature in their interchange of brilliant talk to justify their permanent popularity.

As to the merits of the famous Begum speech it is more difficult to judge. The plays are still acted, and we can observe the effect they produce. But the Begum speech may be said to have passed away as it was delivered, and we can form an opinion of it only by the evidence which we possess as to the impression produced by it at the time. There can hardly be any doubt that this impression was very deep and powerful. It threw the audience into a ferment of enthusiasm, and it was warmly praised by men who were certainly competent to express an opinion on such a subject. Burke in his grand way declared it to be "the most astonishing effort of eloquence, argument, and wit united, of which there was any record or tradition." But Burke had a weakness for superlatives, and an Irish way of saying more than he meant. Indeed we find him almost at the same time bestowing a similar panegyric on Sir Gilbert Elliot's impeachment of Sir Elijah Impey, "the most beautiful that ever was heard, divine beyond human sweetness," with other phrases which Minto was almost ashamed to repeat to his wife, begging her, "for God's sake," not to let any one else hear of them. It was apparently the fashion at this time, when there was more of personal parade in the debates, for the chief men on each side to applaud each other, as if to show how well they could afford not to be jealous of a rival's successes; and some allowance may be made on this account for the lavish praises which not only Burke, but Fox and Pitt, bestowed on Sheridan's oration. Sir G. Elliot mentions that the friends of Sheridan were indignant that Pitt, as soon as the great speech was finished, did not rise to say something handsome about it, and Pitt may on reflection have thought it politic to fall in with the enthusiasm of the moment. Fox, however, asserted twenty years afterwards that the Begum speech was undoubtedly the best speech ever made in the House of Commons, and a similar remark is attributed to Windham. Sir James Mackintosh, who heard the speech, and admitted the effect it produced, thought that the style was too gaudy to be well received in a later age; and Brougham has probably hit the mark in suggesting that a part of Sheridan's success was due rather to the speech having so greatly surpassed all the speaker's former efforts, the great interest of the subject, and the artistic elaboration and delivery of certain fine passages, than to the merits of the whole. No adequate report of this speech has been preserved, but we have the shorthand notes of the speech which he afterwards delivered on the same subject in Westminster Hall, and they certainly do not give one a very high idea of Sheridan's oratory. The style is not merely verbose and redundant, but flabby; the language is coarse and overcharged; and much of the wit is strained or trivial. It is known that Sheridan, with characteristic trickiness, endeavoured to add to the effect of his address by pretending to be quite unprepared, although he had been for days hard at work in getting up the case.

The prevalent notion of Sheridan at one time was, and perhaps to some extent still is, that he was a man of ready and abundant wit, who was too idle to discipline his use of it. In point of fact, Sheridan appears to have been naturally rather heavy and even dull, and to have been largely indebted to his industry, not only in working up such ideas as occurred to himself, but, in appropriating

* The Works of Richard Brinsley Sheridan: Dramas, Poems, Translations, Speeches, and Unfinished Sketches. With a Memoir of the Author, a Collection of Ana, and Ten Chalk Drawings. Edited by F. Stainforth. London: Chatto & Windus. 1874.

the ideas of others. Moore puts it mildly when he says that Sheridan had, in addition to the resources of his own wit, a quick apprehension of what suited his purpose in the wit of others. He was unscrupulous in his pilferings, and helped himself to whatever took his fancy. His famous remark about Pitt, when he was succeeded by Addington, leaving, like Theseus, "his sitting part" behind him, was got from Gilbert Wakefield, who supplied the quotation. In another instance, hearing Sir Philip Francis speak of the Peace as one "of which every one would be glad, and nobody proud," Sheridan hastened into the House to fire off the phrase as his own. Even those, however, whose jokes or epigrams he plundered in this way used to acknowledge that they were usually more successful from his lips than from their own. The leading idea in his Monody on Garrick is borrowed from one of Garrick's own prologues. The conception of Mrs. Malaprop is to be found in *Humphrey Clinker*. The charge which Sneer flings at Sir Fretful Plagiary might with some reason have been applied to Sheridan himself, that he kept stray jokes and pilfered witticisms in his common-place book with as much method as the ledger of the Lost and Stolen Office. One of the sentences in his note-book is, "He employs his fancy in his narrative, and keeps his recollections for his wit." This was afterwards expanded into "When he makes his jokes you applaud the accuracy of his memory, and 'tis only when he states his facts that you admire the flights of his imagination"; and, with slight variations, served Sheridan on several occasions. Another well-worked joke was that about the gipsies disfiguring the children they steal, to which he helped himself in the first instance from Churchill. It turns up in the *Critic*, and was also used in the House of Commons. Some of his Parliamentary fustian was afterwards not inappropriately used over again for *Pizarro*. On the whole, it will be found that impudence and clap-trap form a large element in the sort of wit of which Sheridan was a master. He had a strong sense of humour and stage effect, but without taste or capacity for discrimination. His speeches and his plays are of much the same quality, and both are marked by audacious but successful hits, and by gross and amazing blunders. He had no self-respect to restrain him from committing himself to any escapade either in literature or politics, and was always ready to take his chance of hit or miss in pursuit of those sensational effects which flattered his vanity and gratified his love of excitement. High animal spirits and great plausibility gave force to intellectual qualities of a very moderate grade; and he had, in the midst of his looseness and dissipation, the curious faculty of concentrating on the particular object of the moment a sort of steady, mechanical industry. He was, in short, a rather plodding and heavy Beaumarchais, with all the tricks, but without the genuine brightness and originality, of the Frenchman.

MINTO'S CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH POETS.*

SINCE M. Taine set the fashion of applying the comparative method to the history of a literature, each new essay in that department raises a faint expectation that we shall find traces of an example which ingenuity rendered so fascinating. We are prepared for a neat demonstration of the manner in which each writer was the result of his race, his *milieu*, and his epoch. The announcement in Mr. Minto's preface of a contrast in this respect between his plan and M. Taine's afforded us, therefore, a gentle surprise, not unmixed, it must be owned, with a sense of relief. Mr. Minto tells his readers that they must not expect to find the poets of whom he speaks treated with reference to their race or their social surroundings. M. Taine studied the organism through the medium; Mr. Minto is content to take the organism by itself, and to inquire what it is rather than how it was formed. At the same time he aims at something like an historical view; he seeks to trace how far each poet was influenced by his predecessors or his contemporaries.

This volume covers about three centuries of English poetry—from Chaucer, who died in 1400, to Shirley, who died in 1666. The obvious, if somewhat ungracious, question which a new book on such a question suggests is, What are the distinctive qualities which constitute its reason for existing? Mr. Minto's book appears to us to hold a middle place between a history of literature and a collection of essays or monographs. It is less systematic, less thorough in detail, and less compact in style than a serious history. Where Hallam and Mr. Minto go over the same ground—that is, from the fifteenth century onwards—it is interesting to compare them. Mr. Minto is not diffuse; but he has not Hallam's power of scholarly condensation, by which a paragraph is made to do the work of pages, and to give us the really important points and relations of a writer in the fewest, but most pregnant, words. On the other hand, Mr. Minto is incomparably lighter reading than Hallam, whose plan of course obliged him to suppress picturesque personal details. We are inclined to think that nature or circumstance has been kind to Mr. Minto in prompting him to adopt just this scale for his sketches. If the scale had been smaller, the sketches would, we suspect, have been meagre; if it had been much larger, there might have been an excess of talk, not so heavy as to be prosy, but occasionally verging on twaddle. In the chapter on Shakespeare's Life and Character Mr. Minto notices Malone's way of accounting for Shakespeare's knowledge of legal

terms by the conjecture that he may have been articulated to an attorney at Stratford. Referring to the fact that, when Shakespeare was fourteen, his father mortgaged an estate at Ashbie, Mr. Minto observes that Malone's theory is superfluous:—

There are no family secrets from the children of the poor. Shakespeare doubtless heard the painful deliberations of his once prosperous parents, knew all their difficulties, and perused the mortgage bond with a boy's grave curiosity and awe.

Ingenuity of this kind often hovers on the line which separates the sublime from the ludicrous; and, for our part, we are glad that Mr. Minto's space did not often invite him to fill the gaps of biography with speculations of so subtle a texture. On the whole he has the merit of having written a book which, if neither exhaustive nor original, is fairly readable. It will tell people a good deal about some English poets whom, by a courteous fiction, all educated persons are supposed to know; and a little about several other poets whom the more ambitious few gladly affect to know. Whether a book of this sort is a good thing in itself is another question, and one which we should hesitate to answer in the affirmative. We are inclined to think that the books about good writers have multiplied to an extent which is becoming hurtful to real study of the writers themselves. By all means let us have thorough histories of literature, as well as careful sketches or outlines which will help beginners to keep clearly in mind the relative places and meanings of the books which they read. By all means let us have essays or studies in which particular writers or periods are thoroughly examined and illustrated. But what shall be said of the intermediate book—of one which, like the present, has the thoroughness neither of a history nor of a study? The very fact that it is easy and pleasant reading, and that it gives an intelligent general view of the writer with whom it deals, tends to its being used in practice, not as an introduction, but as a substitute. The slipshod knowledge thus picked up at second-hand may serve a turn for purposes of display, but is more fatal than anything else to largeness and truth of insight, and to the doing of sound work. It would be unjust to charge Mr. Minto with bookmaking. This volume shows not only a great deal of reading, but judgment and taste, notwithstanding a certain deficiency perhaps in that sense of humour which alone can make judgment or taste sure; but it would be just, we fear, to say that Mr. Minto is eminently fitted to be a source of "padding" to others. Any one, of course, who ever wrote,

Might stop a hole, to keep the wind away;

but it is something that there should be the necessity of first turning the noble material into clay; it is something that the user of the plug should have to make it for himself. Our objection is to the ready-made stop-gap; and it is a chatty, dilettante sort of book, like this of Mr. Minto's, neither thorough nor meagre, but just hitting the popular mean, which supplies that article in the most seductive abundance. The educational and the literary tendency of such a book is, in our opinion, to be deprecated. From the point of view of entertainment there is nothing to be said against it. It is well enough done in its way, though we do not think the way a good one; and it will pass time far more pleasantly, and at least more profitably, than scores of books which a dreary conventionality emboldens the Circulating Libraries to class as light reading.

The first chapter, on Chaucer, is one of the best. Chaucer has been somewhat neglected by "the general reader" of this generation, though scholars are now working at him with new vigour and new lights. In the ship of English Poetry he has been the figurehead, of which voyagers do not see much after they are on board. Mr. Minto justly points out that, though Chaucer may be called the "father of English poetry" in being the first great poet who wrote in English, yet the designation is apt to mislead. The originality which it seems to claim is too large. Original, no doubt, Chaucer was, and this in two senses; first, because his work has the impress and breathes the spirit of a strong individuality; next, because this kind of work had never before received a character or expressed a mind distinctively English. But Chaucer was not the founder of a new school of poetry. He was merely the apostle of that school for England. The Trouvères of Northern France derived their impulse from the Troubadours of the South. The *Langue d'Oïl* now essayed to rival those productions for which the *Langue d'Oc* had become famous. But the line of effort was changed in a significant way. The Southern Troubadours had been predominantly lyric. The Northern Trouvères aspired to be epic. They delighted in tales of chivalry, in romances of war or of love, in such heroes as Arthur and his Knights, Charlemagne and his Paladins—Charlemagne, whom no Mr. Freeman had arisen to upbraid them for calling a Frenchman. The Trouvères and the Italian poets who, like them, caught their first inspiration from the Troubadours, were directly the masters of Chaucer. When, indeed, M. Sandras describes him as a mere imitator, whether of Guillaume de Lorris or of Jean de Meun, he loses sight of that distinction, personal and national, which, as has been said, is so vividly stamped on Chaucer's work. But not the less is the intellectual parentage of his genius unmistakable—its strongest characteristic being perhaps that animation, that sentiment of bright colour, of fresh feeling, of rapid ease and gaiety of movement, in which De Quincey found the *Canterbury Tales* superior to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. By the by, we are glad to see that Mr. Minto shows no favour to the crotchet which discovers a grim satirical purpose in the *Canterbury Tales*. Doubtless most of the personages are disreputable in the manner appropriate to

* *Characteristics of English Poets, from Chaucer to Shirley.* By William Minto, M.A. London: Blackwood. 1874.

their several stations and duties in life. The Merchant is of doubtful faith; the Miller steals corn; the Reeve is not above the temptations of office; the Cook is subject to nearly all the infirmities of the flesh; the Monk, the Friar, and the Pardoner are edifying rather as warnings than as examples; the Lawyer and the Doctor are not disposed to cavil at the view that the labourer is worthy of his hire. But these world-soiled pilgrims are, on the whole, a cheerful company, which the Poet joins solely with a view to their agreeable society, and not with the remotest design of taking notes for moral criticism. It is perhaps the best proof of Chaucer's force that nearly all the English poets of the fifteenth century may be regarded as his disciples, though the interval between the leader and the followers would now be estimated somewhat otherwise than it was rated by Skelton, when he could place Gower and Lydgate on a level with their master. Among the successors of Chaucer Mr. Minto rightly numbers Sir Thomas Malory, whose *Morte d'Arthur* was printed by Caxton in 1485. The *Idyls of the King* has lately revived the interest in Malory's prose compilation, and Mr. Minto's account of it will be acceptable to all readers of Mr. Tennyson. It will probably surprise many young ladies to learn that, whereas the Laureate's Arthur is before all things a Defender of the Faith, Sir Thomas's Arthur is, in several minor traits of his history, a decidedly objectionable person; though we quite agree with Mr. Minto that the eloquent apologist of the "Idyls," Mr. Hutton, undertook a work of supererogation when he addressed himself to showing that Mr. Tennyson's conception of Arthur is at all events nearer to Malory's than is Mr. Swinburne's.

In three centuries of literary history it is almost inevitable that there should be deserts—long, sandy tracts, with a sparse population of lyrists and translators; and a good deal of credit is due to the literary historian who proves himself an efficient dragoon in the passage of these arid districts. Mr. Minto gets over his "Renaissance and Transition"—the earlier and middle portions of the sixteenth century—pretty well; though, before emerging into a land flowing with the milk of Arcadia and the honey of Hymettus, there are moments when it would be a joy to descry in the distance even the most dismal of the Elizabethan Sonneteers. The ruling influences of this transition period were Italian. Sackville studied Dante; Gascoigne translated the plays of Ariosto and the prose of Bandello; Spenser owed much both to the *Orlando Furioso* and to the *Jerusalem Delivered*. It would have been well to have shown, more fully than Mr. Minto has done, the nature and the various bents of this Italian action on the literary mind of England—an action which, for more than a century later, continued to be so powerful; and it is just here that Hallam's special mastery of the subject might have given useful guidance. In the chapter on Spenser Mr. Minto has devoted some space to discussing a point in Thomas Campbell's criticism on the *Faery Queen*. Campbell says:—"On a comprehensive view of the whole work, we certainly miss the charm of strength, symmetry, and rapid or interesting progress." Campbell, like Macaulay, had no doubt found the allegorical epic very long and somewhat dull, though he avoids suggesting, as Macaulay did in speaking of the "death" of the Blatant Beast, that he had not succeeded in getting to the end. But what, Mr. Minto asks, is Campbell's meaning when he denies "strength" to Spenser? The criticism certainly seems pointless, unless, with Mr. Minto, we suppose "strength" to mean "the strength arising from clearness and brevity of expression," i.e. lucid terseness. Remembering such passages as the visit of Duessa to Dame Night, and their journey to Æsculapius in the under-world, we must deem it an unhappy choice of language by which "strength," in the natural meaning of the term, is said to be absent from the *Faery Queen*. The chapters on Shakespeare, his dramatic forerunners and successors, are well written, but present little that calls for special remark. In the Shakspearian part of them we were most struck by Mr. Minto's arguments for identifying the "better spirit" of the 80th Sonnet—

O how I faint when I of you do write,

Knowing a better spirit doth use your name

—with Chapman; a theory which seems to fit the conditions more satisfactorily than Massey's hypothesis that Marlowe is intended. The notice of Fletcher may perhaps be cited as especially good. Charles Lamb says that "quite a new turn of tragic and comic interest came in with the Restoration." But Fletcher may properly be considered as the real progenitor of the Restoration drama. As Mr. Minto says (p. 424), he threw into drama "not only the high spirits and daring manner of aristocratic youth, but also a sweet odour of poetry brought from the vales of Arcadia and the gardens of the Faery Queen."

In taking leave of this pleasant book we have only to express a hope—which we feel sure that its author would share—that its readers will remember the significance of its title. Familiarity with the "characteristics" of a writer, however skillfully they may be set forth, is not the same thing as knowledge of the writer himself. This is particularly true in the case of poets. The best lessons which a poet has to teach are not literary, and no literary machinery can make a royal road to their acquisition. They can be learned only by apprehension of the poet's whole nature as expressed in his whole work. This book, *Characteristics of English Poets*, will be fulfilling its proper function only when it is used as an introduction and an aid to the sympathetic study of the poets themselves.

THE BEST OF HUSBANDS.

HITHERTO it has seemed good to Mr. Payn to describe himself upon the title-page of his numerous books only as the author of *Lost Sir Massingberd*. The practice of authors in this respect is the reverse of the practice of politicians. When the name of a statesman has become thoroughly familiar to us all, he changes it for a title. Whatever may be said on political grounds in favour of the practice, it must be admitted that both for contemporaries and for students of history it has its inconveniences. The great name of Pitt was partly eclipsed behind the title of Chatham, and there are a good many modern peers whose identity with former lawyers or statesmen has to be recognized by an effort of the memory. Authors, on the other hand, show their modesty by taking a title from their first publication, and only reveal their true names as they become better known. The change is probably agreeable to most of their readers. We seem to know a man better when we can call him Smith or Jones, instead of regarding him as a kind of impersonal abstraction. We could love Scott, while we had only a vague admiration for the author of the *Waverley Novels*. We may presume that when Mr. Payn discards the title under which we have hitherto known him, it is a symptom of growing popularity and a concession to the demands of a widening circle of readers anxious to have a more tangible object of worship. Perhaps, therefore, we ought to seize the opportunity of making a study of the works to which Mr. Payn now lays claim in his own character. We have reviewed so many of them that this would be a rather superfluous performance; and we shall only say that Mr. Payn has some decided merits which justify his popularity. We will not say whether it is to be reckoned amongst them that he does not aim at being profoundly philosophical or at gratifying the tastes of refined connoisseurs. But it is certainly a merit that he is always lively; that his plots are clearly constructed, and sometimes remarkably ingenious; and that he has a genuine sense of humour, marred—for we have no desire to conceal his weaknesses—by a reprehensible love of bad puns. The present story exemplifies these qualities fairly enough. It may perhaps be not incorrectly described as belonging to that class of fiction of which Mr. Wilkie Collins is the most popular master. There is, that is to say, a mystery which haunts us through a great part of the book; a skilfully compounded riddle, of which we feel that there ought to be a simple solution, and which we are yet unable to solve satisfactorily until the author himself places the key in our hands. Stories which depend for their interest upon the unravelment of a carefully constructed puzzle are of course despised by the more sublime critics, and it is true that they seldom gratify us by any delicate delineation of character and sentiment. When the puppets have to be worked exclusively with a view to conceal the secret strings which pull them, the performer is naturally tempted to overlook the demands of nature and probability. Accordingly, we must confess that, whatever other merits are possessed by Messrs. John and Richard Milbank and Miss Margaret Thorne—the principal actors in this little drama—they do not strike us as being very forcible representations of human nature. They have to act eccentric parts in order to conceal their secret motives from the reader; and it is consequently rather hard to account for some of their actions by the ordinary passions of humanity. Without letting out Mr. Payn's secret, we may endeavour to give some account of the situation, which, we would hope, may excite without satisfying the curiosity of our readers.

John and Richard Milbank, we may say, in the first place, are the regulation pair of brothers—the industrious and idle apprentice of Hogarth—the prodigal son and the virtuous heir; or, in short, the last representatives of the old-fashioned contrast on which a thousand different variations have been performed by as many novelists and writers of tracts. Generally speaking, the novel and the tract take different views of the merits of the question. Authors of tracts take the Hogarthian view of life, and show us the Mansion House as the final goal of the industrious lad's career, and Tyburn-tree at the end of his rival's history. The novelist more generally follows Sheridan, and asks our sympathies for Charles Surface, whilst we are fully prepared to detest the cold-blooded villainy of his hypocritical brother. Mr. Payn, however, in this case agrees with Hogarth. The prodigal brother, Richard, is a thoroughly bad fellow; whilst his brother becomes, not merely in name but in reality, the "best of husbands." We do not mean to say, however, that virtue is rewarded and vice punished, or to say the reverse; for to do so would be to let out the secret so carefully preserved. Thus much indeed must be added. Both Richard and John are in love with the model heroine who is supposed to possess all the virtues. And here occurs an example of the difficulty of which we have already spoken. If Mr. Payn had regarded simply the truth to nature of his story, he would have taken more trouble to explain to us how it comes to pass that the modest, refined, and exemplary Margaret falls in love with the scamp Richard. There is nothing, it may be said, surprising in the fact of an excellent young woman falling in love with a scamp, however worthless intrinsically, simply on the ground of his good looks and pleasant manners. That undoubtedly is quite true; but yet it is unpleasant in fiction, as it is unpleasant in real life, to watch a beautiful girl attaching herself to a thorough-paced scoundrel by reason of the very innocence which prevents her

* *The Best of Husbands*. By James Payn. London: Richard Bentley & Son. 1874.

from even guessing what a blackguard he is. But then the novelist ought to show us, what we are able to see more or less for ourselves in reality, what is the secret of the charm. We should listen to some of the villain's smooth speeches; we should have a taste at least of the wit and high spirits which make him a charming companion; and, though the author should never relent so far as to save his villain's soul, he should be careful to show that the serpent has at least glittering scales. Unluckily Mr. Payn is so intent upon showing the wickedness of the prodigal brother—a wickedness which is necessary to working his plot—that he forgets to exhibit his superficial goodness. He is from the first a drunkard, a gambler, and a debauchee; and not merely is he bad at heart, but his manners are as repulsive as his nature. When he meets his excellent brother, he abuses him in the coarsest manner; he does not even make a pretence of being touched by generous conduct; and, in short, he is so wantonly and outrageously brutal in his whole behaviour that we can only accept Margaret's love for him as a kind of mysterious infatuation. The fault is a considerable one; because it throws a preliminary air of improbability over a story which, whatever its other merits, can certainly not be praised on the score of its resemblance to ordinary life.

The two brothers are brought together by means of a spiteful will of an uncle; in regard to which we shall only say that it seems to us to illustrate the old proposal that novelists should combine to retain a consulting lawyer to keep them straight in legal matters. The two are forced to live together as partners for a year, during which the bad brother takes every possible means of insulting his more respectable relation. John sees that Richard is a brute of the very worst kind, and has yet only too good reason to know that Richard will in all probability marry Margaret at the end of the year. He knows, too, and indeed Richard does not scruple to proclaim to him in the plainest language, that the marriage will mean nothing but a miserable slavery to an unfaithful husband, and yet he considers himself bound in honour not to attempt to open Margaret's eyes. Certainly this is an uncomfortable situation, and when the year is nearly out and John discovers that Richard has committed a forgery, the temptation to the good brother to send the bad brother out of the country by a threat of imprisonment is a very strong one. He proceeds, in fact, to insist upon Richard's voluntary emigration to avoid prosecution; but here occurs the mystery of which we have spoken. Richard suddenly vanishes into thin air. After a time, John marries Margaret, who still prefers Richard but is urged to marriage by her sense of John's noble conduct in various ways; and John becomes the "best of husbands." But, though the best of husbands, he is not the happiest of men. Strange misgivings haunt us. What has become of the prodigal brother? Why does he never even ask for money, or turn up in a ruined condition? Why did John suddenly order a cellar to be bricked up? Could he, the best of husbands, have murdered his brother, and thus taken means to conceal the body? Why do mysterious lights appear at night in the neighbourhood of the said cellar? Why does John refuse ever to be a day absent from the house? Why does he get up at night and hold mysterious conversations with a man whom his wife discovers in the dim light to be one of the most blackguard companions of the missing brother? Why does that ruffian appear splendidly clothed and with pockets full of money directly after the conversation? Why does John, on the other hand, appear next morning with his dark hair turned grey in the course of a single night? What can he have been doing with a spade, a pickaxe, and a barrow in the little copse near the house where there is an old quarry? And what can he have wanted with that bottle of ink, invented by his ingenious father-in-law, and warranted to disappear suddenly at the end of a fortnight and leave nothing but blank paper? How are these questions to be answered? or rather how are they to be answered consistently with a belief that the best of husbands is really what he appears to be, and what indeed the novelist informs us that he really is?

To all which we can only answer that persons desirous of solving the riddle must read the book for themselves. We shall content ourselves with drawing what appears to be the most obvious moral. If you have a brother who is a thoroughly black sheep, cut him off as decidedly and speedily as possible. If you find him out in a forgery prosecute him at once; and if you have reason to suppose that he is in love with the object of your own affections, take care that she knows all about his misdeeds as quickly and fully as possible. Otherwise, however exemplary may be your own conduct, you will find that your own relation may be a thorn in your side throughout life, and you may even die a melancholy death yourself, though you may marry the woman of your heart and be to her the best of husbands.

FRIENDS OF CHATEAUBRIAND.

(Second Notice.)

THE second volume of Sainte-Beuve's work on Chateaubriand and his "groupe littéraire" is chiefly occupied with matter relative to those friends of his who had a direct and appreciable influence on his production. One or two of these had the combined influence of the critic and the friend, and there is a passage

of remarkable interest about criticism which throws a strong light upon what Sainte-Beuve thought of his own craft:—

Le don de critique véritable n'a été pourtant accordé qu'à quelques-uns. Ce don devient même du génie lorsqu'au milieu des révolutions du goût, entre les ruines d'un vieux genre qui s'écroule et les innovations qui se tentent, il s'agit de discerner avec netteté, avec certitude, sans aucune mollesse, ce qui est bon et ce qui vivra. . . .

La nature crée le grand critique, de même qu'elle confère à quelques hommes le don du commandement. D'autres influent plus sensiblement, s'agitent, débordent, entraînent : le vrai juge, le vrai critique, par quelques mots, rétablit la balance. En philosophie, en politique, de nos jours, nous avons vu bien des talents qui étaient des puissances, des forces toujours en action et en mouvement : M. Royer-Collard, tranquille et debout, était une autorité.

L'autorité du vrai critique se compose de bien des éléments complexes, comme pour le grand médecin; mais au fond il y a là un sens à part, comme le tact d'un Hippocrate ou d'un Corvisart.

All this, and more to the same purpose, about the natural gifts of the critic, is both perfectly true and in direct contradiction to the notion so prevalent amongst literary and other artists (novelists, poets, painters, &c.), that it is much easier to criticize than to execute. The criticism which throws a flood of daylight on a work of art, showing it exactly in its right place and relation to other works of art, and which does this *at once*, without waiting to hear the verdict of public opinion, yet does it so accurately that the future can but confirm the verdict—this kind of criticism is much rarer than good art is, and therefore, it may be presumed, is at least equally difficult, whilst it certainly requires uncommon natural gifts and an immense amount of experience and information. The mark of good criticism is that it does not deal in safe and moderate generalizations, but goes boldly into detail, and both praises and blames without softening for fear of being wrong:—

Il ne s'agit pas, quand un nouvel écrivain paraît qui est un homme de génie, même avec des défauts,—il ne s'agit pas de venir dire : *C'est assez bien*, et de faire ce qu'on peut appeler une cote mal taillée des beautés et des défauts, comme fit l'Institut dans ce fameux Rapport sur le *Génie du Christianisme*, comme fit l'Académie pour le *Cid*. "C'est un grand signe de médiocrité de louer toujours modérément" à dit Vauvenargues. Il faut savoir à première vue marquer le cran. Quel mépris n'avait pas La Bruyère pour ces prétendus connaisseurs qui avaient eu sous les yeux le manuscrit de ses *Caractères* sans, bien savoir à quoi s'en tenir et sans oser se prononcer.

Fontanes, who was timid as a poet, criticized frankly and well, and had a salutary influence on Chateaubriand's earlier style, which Chateaubriand willingly acknowledged; but, as Fontanes did not live long enough to be always by the side of his friend, this influence was wanting to René in his decline. Fontanes had a strangely complex character. He was a poet, or at least an elegant versifier, and in his verse, which is evidently quite sincere, he writes delicately and charmingly of his rural life, of the advance of age, and such subjects as would have been chosen by the lyric poets of antiquity, and very much in their tone too, yet not in servile imitation. At the same time (no one would have guessed it from his poetry) he was really a strong and authoritative critic, and a fine orator. M. Thiers in his History says that Fontanes in his oratory spoke the finest language which had been uttered since the time of Louis XIV., and Sainte-Beuve believes that this praise, however high, is just. Then, in addition to these talents, Fontanes possessed personal qualities that won the esteem and confidence of Napoleon I., a severe and capable judge of men, and the very last person in his age to be imposed upon by merely literary gifts, for which, as is well known, he had a feeling bordering upon contempt. Let us add to these traits a curious detail, necessary to complete the portrait of the man. Fontanes had a strong touch of the epicurean in his nature, and had a good and "active" stomach (the adjective is his own), which he gratified by means of those varied and excellent repasts which a Frenchman in easy circumstances, who is not at the same time both *gourmand* and *gourmet*, knows so well how to order and procure. His touch of sensuality does not seem to have been entirely confined to good eating, for, as he dared to confess, "Je ne sais rien de plus agréable qu'un ballet bien indécent après un bon dîner." Sainte-Beuve quotes specimens of his poetry, written exactly in the tone and temper of Horace, yet quite his own. Here are three stanzas, beautifully finished in their way:—

Au bord de ce fleuve limpide,
Le long de mes prés toujours verts,
Si quelque rimeur insipide
Portait son orgueil et ses vers,
Qu'en faisant leur ronde fidèle,
Mes Pénates en sentinelle
L'écartent d'un bras redouté
Même quand la troupe immortelle
Dans l'Institut l'eût adopté.
Mais si Joubert, ami fidèle,
Que depuis trente ans je chéris,
Des cœurs vrais le plus vrai modèle,
Vers mes champs accourt de Paris,
Qu'on ouvre ! j'aime sa présence ;
De la paix et de l'espérance
Il a toujours les yeux sereins.
Que de fois sa douce éloquence
Apaisa mes plus noirs chagrins !
Et si, de ses courses lointaines,
Chateaubriand vient sur ces bords,
Muses de Sion et d'Athènes,
Entonnez vos plus beaux accords !
Qu'au bruit de vos airs poétiques,
Accueilli comme aux jours antiques,
Il prenne place en mes foyers,
Et loin des troubles politiques
Repose ceint de vos lauriers !

* Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire sous l'empire. Par Sainte-Beuve. Nouvelle édition. Paris: Lévy.

The Joubert mentioned in the second stanza is the subject of one of Mr. Matthew Arnold's essays, and most readers who care for what is delicate and refined in French literature will be acquainted with the fragments of Joubert's writing which have been preserved and published by his friends. He also had an influence on Chateaubriand, but quite a different kind of influence from that which Fontanes exercised. The two friends are described as follows by Sainte-Beuve:—

Chateaubriand, jeune, marchait entre les deux. Jamais poète ne trouva deux critiques plus doués d'imagination eux-mêmes, deux critiques amis mieux faits en tous points pour se compléter l'un l'autre et pour le servir. Si l'un, tout classique, l'accompagnait et le soutenait avec un dévouement étonné, l'autre ne s'étonnait pas du tout, et devançait toujours. L'un, ferme et net, athlète au besoin, brisait des lances dans les mêlées pour son ami, et le couvrait de son bouclier; l'autre, vrai sylphe, pur esprit, presque sans corps, voltigeait en murmurant à son oreille des conseils charmants, *leni susurro*. L'un, critique devant le public, plaidait, défendait, et gagnait une cause; l'autre, intime et inspirant au dedans, suggérait mille pensées et insinuait bien des hardiesses; et pour finir par un mot consacré, l'un était la bride et l'autre l'éperon.

Joubert was a perfect idealist, a man of weak unproductive temperament, fond of dreaming, and who had cultivated in himself the most sensitively delicate taste. "Ses jugements littéraires," says Sainte-Beuve, "étaient d'une ténuité, d'une subtilité, et d'une élévation qui, aujourd'hui même, pourrait faire frémir les classiques de seconde main." Sainte-Beuve calls him "Joubert le délicat," and in this single epithet characterizes him as accurately as one word possibly could do. Joubert was constantly occupying his mind with literary subjects, though incapable of the labour of composition, which fatigued him so much that he was obliged to limit his writing to occasional notes and memoranda. His power of conversation seems to have been considerably superior to his literary productions, for the most lively and intelligent men listened to him without impatience. There was in Joubert's mind that perfume of culture and taste which is always an irresistible attraction to men of genius, even when their genius is not so delicately fastidious as the taste whose criticism they value. It is more by the teachings of these rare spirits than by their own independent faculty that more vigorous minds attain to the appreciation of what is exquisite. They are like electrometers, or test-papers, which reveal what coarser faculties could not discover for themselves, and it is an important part of education to have known them:—

En avoir une fois connu un de ces esprits divins, qui semblent nés pour définir le mot du poète: *divine particulum aura*, c'est être dégoûté à jamais de ce qui n'est pas fin, délicat, délicieux, de tout ce qui n'est pas le parfum et la pure essence; c'est se préparer assurément bien des ennuis et bien des malheurs.

Another intimate friend of Chateaubriand was Chénédollé, to whom Sainte-Beuve gives, as it seems to us, a degree of space rather out of proportion to the interest of the subject. Sainte-Beuve's method of arranging literary material had sometimes the defect of displaying the material itself with too complete a forgetfulness of his own personal rôle as a literary artist, so that we have many pages in which the critic is scarcely apparent; and this is the more to be regretted since his own observations are generally much more interesting than the passages from letters and other compositions which he thinks it necessary to quote. Chénédollé was simply a man of refined and poetical tastes who led a philosopher's life, and knew some of the greatest literary people of his time. We confess to a great ignorance of his poetry, which is no longer read except by curious students of an age that has passed away, but the specimens of it here given are not especially encouraging. It is simply versification, seriously ambitious, yet not rising into poetry. We greatly prefer the verses of writers like Fontanes, who compose elegantly, and with a certain lightness of touch, though they may not have such exalted aims. There is a place in literature for the elegant and skilful versifier as distinguished from the poet, but there is scarcely room for the writer who aims at poetry and does not quite succeed. Chénédollé's verses pleased Joubert, but then Joubert was careful to say that they pleased him like moonlight. Yes, that is exactly the degree of heat and light they give. Compared with the work of men endowed with the true fire, they are as moonlight to sunlight, as water to wine. Of the passages quoted by Sainte-Beuve, the following description of a frost in April is the best. It is delicately true, and written by one who had lived much in the country, and taken a constant interest in rural things:—

Le froment, jeune encor, sans craindre la faucille,
Se couronnait déjà de son épi mobile,
Et, prenant dans la plaine un essor plus hardi,
Ondoyait à côté du trèfle reverdi;
La cerisaie en fleurs, par avril ranimée,
Emplissait de parfums l'atmosphère embaumée,
Et des dons du printemps les pommiers enrichis
Balançaient leurs rameaux empourprés ou blanchis.
Mais du soir, tout-à-coup, les horizons rougissent,
Le ciel s'est coloré, les airs se refroidissent;
Et l'étoile du Nord, qu'un char glacé conduit,
Étincelle en tremblant sur le front de la Nuit.
Soudain l'apre Gelée, aux piquantes haleines,
Frappe à la fois les prés, les vergers et les plaines,
Et le froid Aquilon, de son souffle acéré,
Poursuit dans les bosquets le Printemps éploré.
C'en est fait! d'une nuit l'haleine empoisonnée
A séché, dans sa fleur, tout l'espoir de l'année.

Sainte-Beuve thinks that Chénédollé's misfortune was to live too much away from Paris, because it is so difficult to make a literary reputation in the country. Books by themselves, Sainte-Beuve

says, are nothing or little towards the establishment of a reputation; the author ought to be personally present to sustain them, and dispose those who are indifferent to read them. In this perhaps there is some exaggeration of a kind natural to a Parisian, but there is some truth in it, especially in the case of men of mediocre talent, whose works are not strong enough to do without the help of *camaraderie* and the influences of drawing-rooms. By personal influence in the capital, a man of Chénédollé's talent might have won higher reputation, but the great poets may live where they like; their books make their fame for them. In our own country several poets of eminence have lived habitually out of London. A more serious objection appears to have been that Chénédollé was not lucky in the time chosen for the publication of his works. He did not publish till Lamartine and Victor Hugo had won the public ear, and it needed a stronger genius than his to contend successfully against these rivals. It is exceedingly interesting to study the cases of men who have been unsuccessful, and to ascertain the causes of their failure. Sainte-Beuve thinks that at least a remembrance is due to Chénédollé, and that he deserves some attention as "un homme distingué par le talent et par le cœur, qui eut en lui l'enthousiasme, le culte du beau, la verve sincère, les qualités généreuses, et jusqu'à la fin cette candeur des nobles âmes qui devrait être le signe inaltérable du poète."

Chénédollé, like the majority of poetical minds in the earlier part of this century, felt, in all its strength and novelty, that passion for external nature which has had so great an influence on modern literature. Like most of his countrymen, he enjoyed nature more from the classical and rural point of view than from that delight in uninhabited sublimities which has marked the English passion for noble scenery. His very name is that of a pond which he loved in childhood. He remembered later the entranced pleasure with which, at the age of nine, he would pass hours together on a balcony, looking at the slopes of Burey. He observed nature with the most constant attention, and took an unflinching interest in all rural occupations. The following is an extract from one of his note-books:—

J'aime tous les travaux champêtres; j'aime à voir labourer, semer, moissonner, planter, tailler, émonder les arbres, aménager les forêts. Je jouis du blé vert, et j'en jouis en moisson.

En mars, je ne connais rien de beau, de riant, de magnifique, comme un beau champ de blé qui rit sous les premières haleines du printemps.

Depuis trente ans, je m'occupe de l'étude de la nature. Je m'observe sans cesse, je m'étudie sans cesse à la prendre sur le fait.

It was characteristic of Chénédollé that he congratulated himself on having learned Greek late in life:—"Cela présente la pensée sous de nouvelles couleurs et ouvre à l'esprit de nouveaux horizons. L'étude d'une langue, surtout d'une langue très-riche et qui a de belles formes, retrempe et rajeunit l'imagination."

Chénédollé knew several very interesting people, and amongst the rest he knew Rivarol, the astonishing talker. Nothing in the way of brilliant improvisation ever exceeded, if we may believe those who knew him, the torrent of talk that poured from this man's lips. Chénédollé Boswellized him a little, and has preserved specimens of his talk which unquestionably display great intellectual agility. Rivarol seems to have made regular discourses, giving himself a subject to start with, in the form of a defined proposition, on which he lectured with the greatest eloquence, and an absolute intolerance of every other talker. He must have been at the same time a remarkable intellectual curiosity, and a great bore. Here is a vivid description of Rivarol's manner, written by Chénédollé himself:—

Il commençait en effet, et se lançait dans un de ces monologues où il était vraiment prodigieux. Le fond de son thème était celui-ci: Le poète n'est qu'un sauvage très-ingénieux et très-animé, chez lequel toutes les idées se présentent en images. Le sauvage et le poète font le cercle; l'un et l'autre ne parlent que par hiéroglyphes, avec cette différence que le poète tourne dans une orbite d'idées beaucoup plus étendue—et le voilà qui se met à développer ce texte avec une abondance d'idées, une richesse de vues si fines ou si profondes, un luxe de métaphores si brillantes et si pittoresques, que c'était merveille de l'entendre.

Il passa ensuite à une autre thèse qu'il posa ainsi: L'art doit se donner un but qui recule sans cesse, et mettre l'infini entre lui et son modèle. Cette nouvelle idée fut développée avec des prestiges d'élocution encore plus étonnants: c'était vraiment des paroles de féerie. Nous hasardâmes timidement, M. de la Tremoie et moi, quelques objections qui furent réfutées avec le rapide dédain de la supériorité (Rivarol, dans la discussion, était cassant, emporté, un peu dur même).—"Point d'objections d'enfant," nous répétait-il, et il continuait à développer son thème avec une profusion d'images toujours plus éblouissantes. Il passait tour à tour de l'abstraction à la métaphore, et revenait de la métaphore à l'abstraction avec une aisance et une dextérité inouïes. Je n'avais pas d'idée d'une improvisation aussi agile, aussi svelte, aussi entraînée. J'étais toute oreille pour écouter ces paroles magiques qui tombaient en reflets pétillants comme des pierreries, et qui d'ailleurs étaient prononcées avec le son de voix le plus mélodieux et le plus pénétrant, l'organe le plus varié, le plus souple et le plus enchanteur: j'étais vraiment sous le charme, comme disait Diderot.

Chénédollé had the fault of procrastination. He allowed himself too easily the dangerous luxury of leaving things half done in the expectation that they would be finished some time. "Chénédollé écoutait trop le *Démon de la procrastination*, comme on l'a appelé. Il n'invoqua pas assez la *Muse de l'achèvement*, cette muse heureuse, la seule qui sache nouer la couronne." This characteristic is the common one of second-rate intellects when not compelled to produce by the necessity for daily bread. They easily fall into habits of dreaming, not having the great productive energy of the real geniuses, and never feeling perfect confidence in the value of what they do. Chénédollé was in the French University, and first Professor of Literature at Rouen, after which he became *Inspecteur d'Académie* at Caen. He knew Joubert well, and Joubert wrote interesting letters to him, in which were such

good and profitable things as Joubert could think and express better than anybody else. Here is a charming passage of a letter addressed to Chénédollé when he accepted the functions of Inspector. Joubert says that he would have preferred for his friend the uniform and fixed labour of a teacher, on account of the tediousness of detail in the work of an Inspector. However, he continues, there is a sure way of reconciling ourselves to our duties:—

Je vous préviens qu'il y a deux moyens infaillibles de s'y plaire : le premier est de les remplir parfaitement ; car on parvient toujours à faire volontiers ce qu'on fait bien ; le second est de vous dire que tout ce qui devient devoir doit devenir cher. C'est une de mes anciennes maximes, et vous ne sauriez croire quelle facilité étonnante on trouve dans les travaux pour lesquels on se sentait d'abord le plus de répugnance, quand on s'est bien inculqué dans l'esprit et dans le cœur une pareille pensée ; il n'en est point (mon expérience vous en assure) de plus importante pour le bonheur.

Again, towards the conclusion of another of his letters, he says, "J'éprouve que rien n'augmente le découragement autant que l'oisiveté."

Although Chénédollé had the greatest regard for Joubert, he did not see him frequently, and the last of their separations extended over the wide space of twelve years, Joubert dying immediately after. Chénédollé was very intimate also with Fontanes, who most kindly gave much time and trouble to the detailed criticism of his literary work before it reached the public. We get other glimpses of Fontanes through Chénédollé's letters. He speaks of his admirable powers of conversation, which was as fertile and abundant as that of Rivarol, yet in better taste. Fontanes allowed himself full play in his conversation, and tried his powers by talking before he sat down to write, when he became much more severe with himself, and obeyed the inward law of the strictest self-criticism. His friend observes that his mind threw off images and material most abundantly when he corrected the manuscript of some less experienced writer than when he composed on his own account. His notion of taste was so extremely delicate and severe that he became rather timid when he wrote his own poetry, but when he had only to suggest new matter to a friend, he was perfectly inexhaustible. "Barthe, en arrivant chez lui, lui disait : 'Je viens vous demander de la matière poétique ;' et Barthe avait bien raison, car il en donnait tant qu'on voulait." In conversation his audacity of imagery sometimes went rather dangerously far, and there is a capital anecdote in illustration of this. One day he was glorifying Paris and France, and exclaimed—

Babylone ! Thèbes aux cent portes !—Londres n'est que la ville des marchands, ce n'est qu'un grand comptoir. Paris est la ville des arts et des rois. Babylone ! Thèbes aux cent portes ! Voyez-vous Louis XIV assis sur la plus haute des cheminées du palais de Versailles ? Le voyez-vous qui commande à tout son siècle ? Et alors il faisait la description la plus vive, la plus animée, des merveilles de ce règne, des arts, des talents des génies qui y réalisaient d'éclat et de grandeur.

This image of Louis XIV. sitting on the top of the highest chimney at Versailles, and thence commanding "tout son siècle," is one of the most charming instances of ridiculous sublimity we ever met with. Yet the energy and conviction of a man like Fontanes are enough to carry off even such imagery as this. Chateaubriand and Chénédollé used to call Fontanes "le Sanglier d'Érymanthe," on account of his brusquerie and verve, and Chateaubriand declared that the wild boar in the garden of the Tuileries, le Sanglier de Calydon, was his portrait.

ROBY'S LATIN GRAMMAR.*

(First Notice.)

AFTER an interval of three years Mr. Roby has brought out the second and concluding part of his Latin Grammar. For an account of the first part we must refer our readers to the *Saturday Review* for September 30, October 7, and October 14, 1871. We there contrasted Mr. Roby's philosophical method of investigating grammar with the cut and dried style of the *Public Schools' Latin Grammar*, and the present instalment of the work fully bears out the opinion we expressed as to the comparative merits of the two publications. The Fourth Book, of which the present volume consists, is wholly devoted to Syntax, to which is added a long supplement which treats of prepositions and quasi-prepositional adverbs and particles, &c. But before we begin to give any account of it, we must premise that few people will find the same amount of interest in this as in the previously published volume. It required small knowledge of the language, or of its grammar, to follow Mr. Roby through his observations on orthography, and on the inflexions of nouns and verbs. But no one will find the Syntax to be easy reading, and even expert grammarians will often be driven to have recourse to the numerous illustrative examples which are added, before they will understand the full force of Mr. Roby's somewhat novel classifications. He is himself fully aware of this difficulty, and in view of it he says in his preface:—

I have desired to set example above precept, and to appeal to the intuition of my readers, rather than to their power of abstract grammatical conception. A writer on language has herein a great advantage over expositors of many other branches of science, that he can incorporate in his work

actual specimens of the natural objects. I have made full use of this advantage, and aimed at giving my book the form, not so much of a treatise as of a scientific arrangement of specimens interwoven with a *catalogue raisonné*. For this puts grammar in the proper light as an account of what men do say, not a theory of what they should say. Moreover, few except practised grammarians can get a clear conception from grammatical exposition except as a commentary on examples, and as a clue and justification for the arrangement of them.

The term *catalogue raisonné* is not well chosen as descriptive of the matter which is interspersed with the specimens ; and though the writer regards the illustrative portion as given rather from an historical than a scientific point of view, we think we may safely say that it is all the more scientific because of the regard which has been had to the historical development of the language. For, as Mr. Roby justly observes, matters which appear utterly unintelligible when their historical pedigree is left out of the account unfold themselves naturally and simply "when we look along the line of growth."

The Syntax, which occupies the Fourth Book, that is to say, the greater part of the volume, is arranged in twenty-three chapters, which the author has further helped us in the introductory remarks prefixed to it to classify as follows:—

CHAP. I.-IV. describes the names and functions of the several parts of speech, the classification of sentences, the order of the words in a sentence.

CHAP. V.-XIV. gives the use of noun inflexions, partly arranged so as to present a continuous reading of the text on the left hand side page, with the notes opposite to it on the right.

CHAP. XV.-XXIV. contains the use of verb inflexions, part of it being arranged in a similar manner.

There is perhaps no more difficult subject to treat in the way of laying down rules than the arrangement of words in sentences. It is here that refined scholarship is seldom at fault, but the best Latin writer would scarcely be able to give the exact reasons for a given order of words in a sentence he had written, simply because his choice had been guided by instinct and not by reason. The chapter which discusses this subject is perhaps one of the least satisfactory portions of Mr. Roby's Second Part. It scarcely exceeds six pages in length, and might perhaps with advantage have been supplemented with many more examples, especially under the head of Rhythm, which, at least in Cicero's orations, takes precedence of almost every other consideration. We have no right to find fault with an author for suggesting a division which is not strictly logical, when none could have been made which would rigidly answer to logical tests. Yet when, after stating that the order of words is not fixed by any invariable rule, Mr. Roby proceeds to mention the three requirements of "facility of comprehension, emphasis, and rhythm," we are tempted to demur to the distinction drawn between the first two ; for though rhythm will sometimes require a different order from that which would best correspond to facility of comprehension, it is scarcely possible to detach the idea of emphasis from that of facility of comprehension, except indeed where emphasis is connected, as it so frequently is in Tacitus, with such omission of words as renders the sentence obscure. One instance of the violation of a rule which comes under this head of facility of comprehension, as given by Mr. Roby, will illustrate what we mean. Relative pronouns regularly stand at the commencement of their clause. This rule, by the way, seems to us somewhat superfluous, as no one would ever have imagined them ordinarily standing anywhere else. But he notices as exceptional the following instance of an emphatic word being placed before the relative:—

Romam quæ apportata sunt, ad adem Honoris et Virtutis videmus.

Now undoubtedly the word *Romam* is emphatic, but facility of comprehension is not violated, but very much increased, by the arrangement, which is evidently the most natural possible, there being implied in the word the antecedent of the relative *quæ*.

Under the first head we have no fault to find with the rules given, but the poetical exceptions which have been selected are a very inadequate representation of the mode in which the requirements of verse interfere in the Latin poets with the natural order of words as they would have been arranged in prose. The few instances adduced are not indeed badly chosen, but they give, and perhaps Mr. Roby meant them to give, examples of what may occur, and indeed must frequently occur, in the verses which boys make at school. *E.g.*

Ponitur ad patrios barbara præda deos

is of course quite a typical pentameter. So

Solus avem celo deiecit ab alto

exhibits quite a common arrangement. But we should have been glad to see instances of the principle of arrangement as sacrificed in more glaring instances. Such, for instance, as Horace's

Iudo fatigatumque somno ;

and, again, in the same ode two lines further on:—

texere, mirum quod foret omnibus.

Again, under the head of "facility of comprehension" we are told that "in many expressions the order of the words is fixed by custom." This is undoubtedly true ; but it would have been more natural to make a separate class of arrangements which are customary rather than to class such expressions under the head of a rule of which it is difficult to say whether they are instances or exceptions.

As to the observations upon Rhythm and the illustrative examples, we can only say they fairly beat us. None of the examples selected appears to us to be particularly rhythmical, and

* *A Grammar of the Latin Language, from Plautus to Suetonius.* By Henry John Roby, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. In two Parts. Part II. containing Book IV., Syntax. Also Prepositions, &c. London : Macmillan & Co. 1874.

we scarcely see how they apply to the two general observations to which they are appended. We have no other means of judging, but they suggest to us that the author has not any very distinct perception of cadence. If he had transcribed the opening sentences of the speech for the poet Archias, his readers would have understood how, at least in an oration, attention to rhythm produces a most wonderful effect. And why he should have fixed upon certain adverbs, *nam, enim, &c.*, to tell us whether they may or may not begin a sentence, and omitted to notice others, as, for instance, the conjunctions *que* and *autem*, we are quite at a loss to determine.

On proceeding to the use of noun inflexions, which occupies the second part of the Syntax, we find the cases are separately treated, beginning with the nominative and ending with the genitive. We select the dative, not as being the most important point, but because it is not treated at such great length as the other cases are, and we shall be able to criticize it more easily within a brief compass. The two senses in which Mr. Roby says it is used are:—

- A. To express the *indirect object*, which is usually a person.
- B. *Predicatively* in a quasi-adjectival sense.

Most readers will require some explanation of this distinction, and possibly it may be thought that it is a distinction, not indeed without a difference, but scarcely warranted by any advantage that accrues from its consideration. The difference of the relation in which the noun in the dative stands to the rest of the sentence from that in which the genitive occurs is most justly described, but it does not appear to us to bear out the text to which it is appended as a note. We do not see why the indirect object should be described as usually a person just because it is more often a person than a thing. But Mr. Roby shall speak for himself:—

A. (1.) The indirect object is the person (or thing) affected by the occurrence of an action or by the exercise of a quality, although not directly or primarily acted on (person from or to whom).

The word put in the dative belongs properly to the whole predicate (whether principal or subordinate), and not (as the genitive) to some particular word, though there is often some word in the sentence (*e.g.* verb, adjective, preposition in composition, substantive) whose meaning is naturally supplemented by such an indirect object.

The Augustan and later writers, especially poets and historians, often employed the dative to express loosely but vividly what as a mere matter of fact would be more precisely expressed by a preposition with its case.

Now it seems to us that Mr. Roby, in describing this indirect object as usually a person, is straining a point for the purpose of exhibiting a distinction between this use and the other, which he has marked (B) and which he speaks of as a dative of the thing. The instances which he gives are numerous, and the dative of the person occurs more frequently than that of the thing, but no principle is involved in this fact, if fact it be. Take one of the instances he has himself given:—

Scire volam quantum simplex hilarisque nepoti
Discrepet et quantum discordet parvus avaro.

Surely if the expression had been in prose instead of verse, and the comparison had been instituted in the abstract instead of the concrete, between the qualities instead of the persons possessing them, the same construction might have been used.

The other use of the dative is described as follows:—

B. Predicative dative: that which a thing (or person) serves as, or occasions.

And here the note of explanation is exact and philosophical:—

Usually a semi-abstract substantive, always in the singular number, and without any attribute except sometimes *magnus, major, minor, maximus, summus, nullus, tantus, quantus*, and (chiefly in Plautus) *bonus*. In this use the dative approximates to an adjective, the superlative of which is found by the addition of *magnus, &c.*

A personal dative is generally added (as indirect object). Instances of this use are arranged under two heads:—

1. With the verb *esse*, such as—

Nec tamen impedito id rebus gerendis fuit.
Ea res nemini unquam fraudi fuit;

and

2. With *habere, ducere, dare, &c.*, and (but *auxilio, praesidio, subsidio* only) with verbs of motion, &c., as—

Paupertas probro haberi, innocentia pro malivolentia duci cepit,
and
Equitatum auxilio Caesari miserant.

A distinction is drawn between this class of dative and one which occurs in a subdivision of (A), which is described as the dative “of work contemplated, chiefly verbal substantives, especially gerundial expressions dependent mainly on substantives or *esse*,” of which the following are instances:—

Q. Fabius comitia censoribus creandi habuit
Hunc sibi domicilio locum delegerant.

We give it in Mr. Roby's own words:—

The difference of these datives from those of the class B § 1153 sqq., is shown by the fact that these (in theory at least) are convertible with genitives, those with predicative nominatives or accusatives. The former express a sphere of operation, the latter express the light in which a thing is viewed, or the character which is ascribed to it. Both are connected more or less with substantives in the sentence; but in the former their substantive is rather governing than governed (*e.g.* *dies colloquio*, a day for a conference, a conference day); in the latter, rather governed than governing (*e.g.* *navitis exitio*, ruin or ruinous to sailors).

An illustration occurs in

Extremo prioris anni comitia auguris creandi habita erant,
where the genitive is actually used in place of the dative.

Our remarks on this small portion of the Grammar have extended to so great a length that we must reserve for a future occasion some notice of the verbal inflexions, especially those of the subjunctive mood, as well as some remarks on that part of the supplement to the Syntax which treats of prepositions.

WOMAN 'S A RIDDLE.*

THERE are people who speak with thoughtless contempt of the ordinary novel-reader, and consider him a being for whom no fiction is too crude, no plot too absurd and unnatural. Yet there are moments when one is inclined to fancy that the students who read novels steadily, and read them all, must be the great unconscious poets of the human race. Nothing is a more certain mark of the poet than his power of bringing beauty and order to everything that he contemplates. He detects harmonies and contrasts, subtle tones and fleeting charms, invisible to the eyes of others. “I don't see that in Nature,” some one said, who was watching Turner at his easel. “No, but don't you wish you did?” replied the painter. And just as Turner saw colours more glowing and shadows more evanescent than appear to ordinary mortals, the novel-reader must somehow out of his own abundance bring life to the most wooden characters, and consistency to the most incoherent plot. We wish we could see these things as he apparently sees them. This vision and faculty would make the reading of books like *Woman's a Riddle* a much less unpleasant task than it is at present. We might find ourselves interested in the characters, the first conception of which is not amiss; and in the plot, which has some elements of merit. In fact, we might be satisfied with those good intentions which the author, like Mr. Wilkins Micawber, has unfortunately failed to carry out in any one direction.

It was rather a happy notion to put the story of this book into the mouth of a governess and companion of the heroine's, a Miss Caroline Rudd. Miss Rudd describes herself as the Chorus of the tale, “whose business it is to make the actions of the personages of the story consequential,” whatever she may mean by that. She certainly acts with energy on the Horatian maxim *consiliatur amice*, and she fills up every pause in the story with fluent moralizing and spurts of friendly advice. Her position is a peculiarly favourable one for dispassionate observation, and she is assisted by the extraordinary and inexplicable frankness with which all the characters confide to her their wishes and their secrets. She meets, at a house where she is governess, a certain Sir Gervase Warmstrey, a pompous and prosy old baronet. To see her is the same thing with Sir Gervase as to think that she would be the best possible guide and friend for his niece, and probable heiress, Katherine Ludlow, a young lady whose education has been absolutely neglected. As soon as he has engaged Miss Rudd, he lets her know that there is a blot on Katherine's birth, that she is the child of a *mésalliance* on the part of his sister. Miss Ludlow is equally open. “I have low blood in me. My father wasn't a gentleman. He dropped his *k's*, and was very polite to his betters, which is a sure sign of low breeding.” Next a Mrs. Carey, who wishes the Baronet to marry her daughter, as good as confesses her designs to Miss Rudd the very first time she sees her. Their acquaintance has not advanced far before she tells her the tale of her daughter's previous engagement to a cousin, a Captain Tavener, a man of the worst character. The daughter, who is described as a “rippling” and “nestling” creature, is equally gushing. She is scarcely married to the pompous Sir Gervase before she discusses with her companion the kind of heaven that may be expected to await her husband. It is to be “a paradise in those unexplored regions which lie around the North Pole. The several states of beatitude would be represented by various heights of icebergs.” Yet Miss Rudd tells us nothing about herself to account for these unanimous bursts of confidence. She is not like Esther in *Bleak House*, who is always doing kind actions, and then wondering in a wearisome way why every one loves her so much. Miss Rudd never wonders, but takes all this respect and affection as her due. Yet, if we consider her merely as an instructor of youth, her language is the reverse of what might be wished. A governess might be expected to know that *du trop* is not French, and that to talk of the “Captain being round” is not a grammatical way of saying that the Captain paid a morning visit. These are only ordinary specimens of her slipshod style. Her moral qualities do not appear to have been attractive. There is something very spiteful in her account of the evil fates of the unpleasant children whom she was at first engaged to teach. And her own didactic language is as prosy and dreary as the Baronet's, except when she snubs her pupil in this elegant way:—“Have done with your nonsense; you are like a sailor's parrot, only capable of speaking wicked words, or screaming nonsense.” No wonder Katherine Ludlow said:—“You don't speak to me as I want to be spoken to.”

It must be admitted, however, that Miss Ludlow was a very trying pupil. “There was something wonderfully beautiful in her eyes, untamed and composite as that expression was. In watching her sometimes Coleridge's strange line would come into my head, ‘Woman waiting for her demon lover.’” In her character, “if there was much of coarseness, there was absolutely nothing of vulgarity.” This distinction does not seem to be based on any difference

* *Woman's a Riddle; or, Baby Warmstrey.* By Philip Sheldon. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1874.

in the case of Miss Ludlow, who calls the servants by such names as Swallow-tails, is on intimate terms with the housemaid, writes a letter in which she says that her uncle's wife is "high and mighty," and generally behaves with incredible meanness and rudeness. The fact is that the author of *Woman's a Riddle* has failed in what looks like an attempt to copy the heroine of one of the most powerful and least pleasant of recent French novels. He has given Katherine Ludlow the dark "mesmeric" beauty, the passion, and the waywardness of Julia de Tréceur, but he has completely failed to draw a wicked woman who is a lady in spite of all her faults. It is true that he tries to show that Katherine's vulgarity was merely a form of perversity adopted to annoy her tediously polite uncle and guardian. But vulgarity is the essence of her nature, and she is even more offensive after Sir Gervase's death than she was when his prim formality provoked her impertinences.

When this young lady heard that her uncle was so disgusted by her many offences that he had determined to disinherit her and marry Miss Carey, her language was forcible and peculiar. "She said in a low voice, 'I wish God would strike my uncle dead.' 'And next,' she said, with striking intensity of articulation, 'I wish God would strike Miss Carey dead.'" It was clearly time that a girl who cherished sentiments of this kind should be separated from the people she disliked. So Katherine was sent to school, but no one could dream of parting with Miss Rudd, who remained at the Hall as companion to the wife of Sir Gervase. Miss Carey, now Lady Warmstreys, was greatly in need of what Becky Sharp calls a sheep-dog. Her angelic purity was such that she saw no harm in the most glaring and obvious improprieties. She is the favourite character of the author, who considers her very weakness amiable. But there is a difference between weakness and imbecility. No doubt there are women who are the more loved for their want of strength and need of protection. But Lady Warmstreys is represented as impossibly childish and feeble. Her home is most unhappy, for her husband is a martinet, who lives in obedience to the clock, and terrifies her with his demands that she should act energetically as mistress of his household. He has scarcely returned from his wedding tour when he forbids his wife's mother to enter the house, merely because she bores him as a mother-in-law. Lady Warmstreys pays secret visits to her mother's cottage, and there meets the cousin to whom she had been engaged. Her conduct at once becomes worse than silly. She says about her cousin:—

A face that we have not seen for a long time recalls those little poems which made the past melodious. My cousin has awakened the memory of one of those little songs in my heart, and its voice makes me cheerful.

It is in vain that Sir Gervase forces the mother to leave the neighbourhood, and forbids the cousin to enter his house. During her husband's absence in town, Lady Warmstreys takes solitary walks with Captain Tavener, and enjoys a variety of little songs in her heart. Miss Rudd remonstrates, but is disarmed by her Ladyship's childlike innocence:—

"Do you think there is any harm in my seeing Philip in the same way as I saw my mother?"

"But your Ladyship doesn't place a cousin on the same level as your mother?"

"I wouldn't if I had mamma here. But next to her it pleases me to have Philip to talk to. You can't guess, Miss Rudd, how much we find to chat about. He remembers poor papa—you see his father was papa's brother—and was recalling just now some amusing traits in his character. He was also telling me what officers' wives do in India to pass the time; how dreadfully they flirt, and what a number of them run away from their husbands. Poor Philip, he certainly is very droll. He makes me laugh so that I am sometimes quite ashamed. He tells a story very beautifully; to listen to him is like reading a novel. I think him clever, Miss Rudd, don't you?"

So, in spite of her husband's commands, Lady Warmstreys went on passing the time in the same way as, according to Captain Tavener, officers' wives used to do in India. It was plain to what Miss Rudd calls the "viewless eye of some Coming Event" that there must be an end sooner or later to this sort of thing. The pages in which we are told what that end was are by far the best in the novel. The situation is powerfully conceived, and worked out with unusual force, consistency, and feeling. If one situation could redeem a story, the description of the events which culminate in the death of Sir Gervase would give a tolerably high place to *Woman's a Riddle*.

Unfortunately, the writer falls into a more sluggish style after this effort, and Lady Warmstreys ceases to be touching, and returns to her normal silliness. She permits Captain Tavener to join her mother and herself on the Continent, and when her mother dies she marries her cousin, and returns with him to England. At first her life seems to have every promise of happiness, but the real tragedy to which all that has gone before is only what Miss Rudd calls "a sketchy prelude" now begins. Captain Tavener complains of the insults which Katherine Ludlow heaps upon him, and the author goes on with his coarse imitation (as it strikes us) of Julia de Tréceur. No one who has read that novel will be astonished when Katherine and the Captain elope together. But, as there is no hint of the growth of any passion between them, nor any token of that tragic fatality whose presence is felt through the whole of M. Feuillet's story, other readers may be a little surprised. Katherine was animated perhaps by her hatred of her uncle's widow, and her passion for revenge. But, as Miss Rudd herself remarks, "no theory of human wickedness that I could form seemed elastic enough to include the possibilities of such deliberate, naked, shocking duplicity as this man had been guilty of." That is exactly what we have to object to. No theory of human folly will account for the confusion in this

straggling and careless tale. It is not woman only that is a riddle in this book, but man, and even the solar system itself. Philosophers who think that the business of philosophy is to reconcile apparent contradictions will find some easy examples for beginners in *Woman's a Riddle*. How, for instance, did it happen that the moon, which in the evening was small-horned, delicate, and wan as a wreath of mist, by ten o'clock made the sky "luminous with white haze," and "sailed silvery and serene above the house"? How was it that Mrs. Carey came to ask a nephew whom she reprobated so strongly as she did Captain Tavener to stay with her for a fortnight? How can Miss Rudd speak of "the furtive interest that is peculiar to me," and of her "decided aversion to seeking or fusing excitement in interests that cannot by any known means be my concern." How could Sir Gervase be so anxious that his niece should be placid and lady-like, and at the same time wish his wife to "rate the maids for imaginary wrongs, and, in fine, develop or degenerate into something bustling, awkward, busy, and useless." Miss Rudd observes that Katherine Ludlow "would fib with happy dexterity, and maintain without flaw, by the aid of a memory singularly retentive and exact, the *vraisemblance* of her invention." It is a pity that the author of *Woman's a Riddle* has not the same happy dexterity. For lack of it, there is an entire want of *vraisemblance* in a story which, in spite of an unpleasant plot, might have been made powerful and interesting. As it is, the words of Mr. Tulliver, "Everything's a moodle," would make a better title to this book than *Woman's a Riddle*.

NEATE'S SPECIMENS OF COMPOSITION.*

THIS production of Mr. Neate is certainly not open to the imputation of being what the Greeks proverbially called *μυα καὶ κάρω*. But, though thus as far as possible from constituting a *μυα βιβλίον*, its intrinsic merits are such that it cannot but rank much higher, in the opinion of competent judges, than many works of considerably greater bulk and noisier reputation. Mr. Neate introduces his little book to the public after this fashion:—

The following pages are intended chiefly as a preface or introduction to something which the author proposes to write on the important, and, as it soon will be, pressing question of the comparative value of ancient and modern languages as instruments for developing the faculties, and as means of imparting knowledge.

Mr. Neate adds that he ventures, as certainly without any presumption he may venture, to think that he is "entitled to speak as a witness on the comparative use of the French and Latin languages." Now, in looking upon this small volume as a preface or introduction to something else, we have only to say, So be it. Taking our own experience, however, as a guide, we have too great a reliance upon the instincts of human laziness to waste much faith upon this unexecuted promise—a promise to be fulfilled some time or other, in some shadowy division of the indefinite hereafter. Anything coming from Mr. Neate's pen will be cordially welcomed by us—as soon as it comes. In the meantime the preface or introduction to this unwritten work contains—first, specimens of Latin verse; secondly, specimens of Latin prose—a mastery over which such as Mr. Neate displays is, we need scarcely say, a much rarer accomplishment. Then we have passages of French prose, selected from a book published more than twenty years ago, in the shape of an imaginary dialogue between M. Guizot and Louis Blanc, "both of them being supposed, rather prematurely," as Mr. Neate remarks, "to be then politically dead." Finally, the author has added a specimen of his English writing, as "having some relation to the question of how far the Latin and French languages are conducive to the formation of an English style."

With these English specimens, as being, in our judgment, the least important and noteworthy subdivision of the work, we will begin. They do not, as far as we can see, throw any particular light upon the question which Mr. Neate by their help proposes to elucidate; and we should have much preferred to know what Mr. Neate could accomplish in the difficult art of French verse. The beauty of his Latin poems, taken in conjunction with his undoubted command over the French tongue, leads us to believe that any compositions of his in that kind would be well worth reading; but he gives us none. To return, therefore, to these English specimens. They are taken from a work published some years ago, advocating the abolition of capital punishment. Mr. Neate is never otherwise than a thoughtful writer, and thoroughly conscientious in the treatment of any subject that engages his attention. He has accordingly the merit of always originating what we read as his, and, if sometimes wrong, he is at least never commonplace. His arguments in support of his thesis appear to us wire-drawn and over-refined. But then we belong to that thick-skinned class of philanthropists whose sympathies are reserved altogether for the maimed and murdered victims of the gentry on behalf of whom Mr. Neate is here holding a brief. We therefore leave the subject-matter of this essay to be weighed and valued by others, and only consider these specimens as what they here purport to be, specimens of English style. From this point of view we shall have little to say of them. The style is good enough; better than the average, one may fairly say, but still not exceptionally good; above all, we cannot discover a trace of

* *Specimens of Composition*. By Charles Neate, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College. Oxford and London: Parker & Co. 1874.

French inspiration from beginning to end. The sentences, if they had been composed as French sentences, would, we are sure, have been put through their paces with absolute neatness and precision. As it is, some of them seem to straggle and sprawl a little. Moreover, they rather strike us as being, according to a common enough piece of slovenliness among English prose writers, somewhat *over-which*. However, in this we are perhaps too fastidious, some very great writers, including Macaulay, not being able to drive that pig-headed relative pronoun entirely to our satisfaction. We have therefore no wish to deny that the style upon the whole is good and the reasoning acute.

The Latin verses we shall take next in order; of them we can fairly say that they strike us as being of unusual merit. Mr. Neate has the power of varying his style; of giving us, when it is his cue to imitate Ovid, the slacker and more fluent versification of Ovid, whilst at other times the more massive periodical rhythms of Virgil and Lucan are reproduced with equal success. We quote six lines from some original verses in a poem on "the Heroism of Woman, a common story":—

Talibus exploras, Deus optime, pectora plagis
Feminea, atque idem celesti numine firmas,
Scilicet in durum suavis constantia sortem
His datur, atque animi virtus sine pulvere nostri;
Sit satis ergo viris muliebri corde supremum
Expectare diem, nec sponte lacessere fatum.

The speech of Moloch in *Paradise Lost* is very powerfully translated. We submit to our readers the end of it from the line—

What fear we then, what doubt we to incense
His utmost ire? . . .
Quid metuendum igitur, cur non extrema malorum
Sollicitet juvet? Sævus licet ultima tentet,
Aut nos in nihilum rediget Deus (unde Creatos
Jactat voce sua), quanto hoc prestantius esset
Quam nova perpetuis consumere secula pœnis—
Vel si etiam nobis virtus divini insit
Que non esse vetet, si qua asperiora supersint,
Hæc citra fines nihil consistere debent;
Æternumque licet, quod jam potuisse videmur,
Tristibus excubiis corrumpere gaudia cœli
Divinasque domos violare incurisibus, Ipse
Sit licet intactus, sed et Ipse dolebit, et hostem
Fortiter ulcisci sua sit victoria victis.

But, as we have intimated above, Mr. Neate will find many more rivals as an imitator of Virgil and Ovid than as an adept in the diction of Cicero. The art of writing Latin prose, a very noble accomplishment, is not cultivated in this country as assiduously as it ought to be. Mr. Neate, however, is an honourable exception to this idleness and indifference on the part of our English scholars. In his dialogue between Cicero and Cleopatra—a dialogue suggested by the well-known expression "*Reginam odi*"—Mr. Neate has shown a dexterous scholarship and a power of dramatic representation possessed by few. The introduction in the style of one of Cicero's familiar epistles strikes us as being very like the original both in sentiment and style:—

Bene facis, me iudice, quod de me queris, quisnam fuerit ille meus cum Regina superbissimâ concursus, quem tam leviter et strictim scribendo attigerim. Amici enim est scire velle quod amicus aut dixerit aut fecerit aut passus sit, et posteris fortasse curæ erit audire, quousque et in ipsâ Româ et in virum consularem, ne plura de me dicam, illud tandem proruperit portentum Regiæ insolentia, &c. &c.

A comparison between Homer and the Nile belongs by right of prior occupation to De Quincey; but it is thrown into graceful and effective Latin; whilst Mr. Neate's manner of characterizing the art of Egypt seems to us excellent in point both of thought and of style:—

Interdum tamen contactu artis Ægyptiacæ Sol ipse fit musicus, nec ullo Musarum comitante choro, solus autem et invisus, ut Deum decet, vasta locorum silentia lentâ divini cantus dulcedine perfundit. Incuriosum enim aliquod *αἰῶνας* habet ars omnis nostra, quæ famæ et opinionis securâ, stabilitate suâ æternitatem sibi parit, nulliusque mundi ætatibus non æqualis esse visa, fluxa humani generis secula, longasque, ut sibi videntur, spes hominum brevitatis simul et vanitatis arguit.

Cleopatra, moreover, not content with silencing Cicero, quotes, or at least all but quotes, Virgil—a great literary feat to be performed in the lifetime of Julius Cæsar. We have long known, of course, that Bacon wrote all the plays of Shakspeare; are we to learn further, in our old age, that the true author of the *Æneid* was Cleopatra? If Virgil had, by any accident, overheard the conversation here recorded, the line in the *Métromane*—"Ce sont des vols qu'ils nous ont faits d'avance"—would undoubtedly have come into his mind.

What we have said of Mr. Neate's Latin prose we must repeat, with even stronger emphasis, of his French dialogues. For ten men who might write Latin verses on good terms with Mr. Neate we should be fortunate in finding one to equal his imitations of Cicero and Seneca; but even the rare acquirement of writing excellent Latin prose is common and almost vulgar compared with a thorough knowledge of, and mastery over, French. Most of us possess a certain slovenly familiarity with that admirable language; but an Englishman who can write a French essay as if he were an educated Frenchman is almost harder to find than the honest man of Diogenes. Mr. Neate, however, has succeeded in his most arduous task. His political dialogues between Louis Blanc and Guizot gained the admiration of the distinguished interlocutors themselves. They both sought Mr. Neate's acquaintance, being struck by the fairness, eloquence, and mimetic power with which he had drawn their intellectual likenesses. Other eminent men also have followed that example, and have often expressed the

high esteem in which they hold this remarkable—we believe we might add, this unique—production. The French of these dialogues is excellent; but, even supposing that a keen critic from the Academy were to tell us that a certain turn of words here, a certain epithet there, betrayed the foreign origin of the work, we should fall back in full confidence upon the solidity of the thoughts, and upon the spirit, grace, and energy of the diction. We give one extract from the supposed Louis Blanc, and another from the supposed M. Guizot, and thus conclude, heartily recommending this little book to our readers. The first passage is put into the mouth of M. Guizot, and is meant to prove how nature herself eternally baffles that envious longing after equality so deeply implanted at present in the French mind:—

Et si après tout l'inégalité des conditions vous répugne par son caractère forcé, et parce qu'elle ne répond souvent à aucune différence de capacité ou de mérite, dites moi un peu, la gloire que vous aimez tant et dont vous faites sonner le nom si haut, qu'est elle sinon souvent la plus injuste, et toujours la plus grande des inégalités? Et la mort, cette reine dont vous ne pouvez briser le sceptre, dont vous cherchez plutôt à vous faire les ministres et les courtisans, quelle inégalité plus extrême, et, s'il est permis de le dire, plus intolérable que la sienne? Nivelez tant que vous voudrez les conditions de la vie, faites asseoir le pauvre à la table du riche, ou, ce qui vous sera plus facile, faites coucher le riche sur le grabat du pauvre, vous aurez peu fait pour égaliser les destinées des hommes, tant que vous n'aurez pas empêché la vieillesse et le vice de fouler la tombe de la jeunesse et la beauté.

We have not room to quote the whole of M. Louis Blanc's views about property, illustrated by a description of the Athenians, to show how slavery had its uses once, as property has now, and how to that slavery the Athenians were indebted for much of their civilization:—

Si nous voulons apprécier cette civilisation au point de vue moderne, c'est à cela, c'est à dire à l'esclavage, qu'il faut surtout attribuer ou imputer ces habitudes de grand seigneur, ces vices de bonne compagnie, cette insolence tempérée par la bonne humeur, cette fatuité assaisonnée par le bon goût, cette candeur dans la corruption, cette grâce dans la crapule, qui faisaient des Athéniens un peuple tout à fait comme il faut, un peuple Louis Quinze.

The value at which intellectual exercises of this kind are estimated will, of course, differ among different men; but every one, we think, must admit that those of Mr. Neate's are excellent of the kind.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

AT the very hour when thanksgivings for the happy attainment of the millennial anniversary of the old Norse colony were being offered in the churches of Iceland, Herr Konrad Maurer* dated the preface to a volume designed to serve as a permanent memorial of that striking celebration, from which the introduction of constitutional government will also be dated. The work is worthy of the occasion, and of the thirty years of research on which it is based. A dozen volumes, says the author, would have been needed to enable him to tell all he knows; but he has judiciously contented himself with condensing the most essential particulars into one. The history of Iceland is doubly interesting; first, from its romantic character, which has perhaps already received sufficient justice at the hands of historians; secondly, as an instance, during at least a considerable part of its course, of the development of a people in almost total seclusion from external influences. The chief exception is the introduction of Christianity into the country, which was undoubtedly a serious interruption of the national traditions. The most zealous Christian might find a difficulty in repressing the wish that the Icelanders had been left undisturbed for a thousand years, in order that it might be seen what form the Odin faith would have eventually assumed among a people of so much natural intelligence. Still, even as matters stood, the triumph of the new creed was in the main the work of native conviction; the Icelanders were neither enlightened and overmastered by the superior civilization of foreign instructors, nor coerced into conformity by such rough missionaries as Charlemagne. The evolution of political and legal institutions, however, is strictly indigenous, and furnishes a most interesting example of the national genius for organization. It forms the leading subject of Herr Maurer's work. He traces the germ of the Icelandic constitution to the sense of religious obligation which led the chiefs of the early immigrants to erect and endow temples. These gradually became the nuclei of communities, and as the need for a bond of union made itself felt, the conception of the religious congregation, and the authority of its head, were gradually extended to secular affairs. The administrative system thus gradually originated, the body of jurisprudence which grew out of it, the magistracy, the popular assemblies, the care of the poor, the modifications arising from the introduction of Christianity, the decay of national independence and the subjugation by Norway, are all made the subjects of minute but by no means tedious investigation. Interesting chapters are added on Icelandic literature, and on the industry and commerce of the island during its period of self-government. The entire absence of pretension serves to enhance our sense of the solid merit of the book.

The second part of the first volume of Fontane's history of the Franco-German war† brings the narrative down to the capitulation of Metz. Like the former part, it is full of matter, but rather adapted for reference than perusal. Heyde and Froese's history of

* *Island von seiner ersten Entdeckung bis zum Untergange des Freistaats.* Von Konrad Maurer. München: Kaiser. London: Asher & Co.
† *Der Krieg gegen Frankreich, 1870-71.* Von T. Fontane. Bd. 1. Hft. 2. Berlin: Decker. London: Williams & Norgate.

the investment of Paris* is a valuable work from the point of view of the military engineer, for whom alone it is designed.

Signor Massari† is a leading member of the Conservative section of the Italian Parliament; he was intimately acquainted with Cavour, and has every qualification for writing his life except a decided call to biographical composition. The absence of this renders his work somewhat tame; it is nevertheless enlivened by a good deal of personal anecdote, and will be found useful as a condensed account of the public life of the great Italian statesman. Signor Massari's work offends neither by shapelessness nor prolixity.

A just perception of the degree in which these faults deform the majority of modern biographies has mainly suggested Rudolf Gottschall's‡ project for the publication of a biographical series which is to be distinguished above all things by symmetry and conciseness. The idea is excellent, and the execution promises to be meritorious. The first volume contains four lives of notable personages by eminent writers—that of Luther, by H. Rückert; of Cromwell, by Reinhold Pauli; of Henry IV. of France, by M. Philippson; of Voltaire, by Rosenkranz. The choice of subjects, it will be seen, is mainly determined by the present circumstances of Germany; all bear directly or indirectly upon the national contest with Rome. The treatment of each subject is correspondingly influenced; Cromwell, for example, being regarded less from the English point of view than in the relation of his policy to Continental affairs. This, however, can hardly be censured under the circumstances, while the literary execution of the respective biographies fully justifies the professions of the prospectus.

Otto von Guericke §, burgo-master of the city of Magdeburg in the seventeenth century, was a man of versatile abilities, eminent in the conduct of local business, but chiefly distinguished as an inventor and experimenter in physical science. After the sack of his native city by Tilly, at which he was present, he entered the Swedish service, and was subsequently concerned in the unsuccessful negotiations through which Magdeburg sought to attain the rank of a free city of the Empire. In his latter years he produced a work in defence of the existence of a vacuum, and a history of Magdeburg, two-thirds of which are lost. His biographer claims for him the merit of having made the first step towards the construction of an electrical machine.

An account of the conclave which resulted in the election of Pope Innocent XIII. || (1721) is an interesting addition to the journals of the Conclavisti. It is less fertile in scandals than the majority of such documents, party spirit not having run very high on this occasion, and intrigue being less busy than usual. The choice ultimately arrived at was unanimous, and encountered the utmost reluctance, real or affected, in the Cardinal upon whom it fell. The most dramatic incident of the proceedings was the appearance, under a safe-conduct, of Cardinal Alberoni, then an exile from Spain and persecuted by the late Pope. The narrative is translated from the Italian, and is couched in the conventional form of a letter to a friend. The translator has added a version of a MS. circulated before the Conclave, and treating of the prospects of the members of the Sacred College, or rather of the seniors among them; it being taken for granted that, the Holy Spirit notwithstanding, no one under sixty would have any chance. A warning of Pasquin's is quoted, which has since been strikingly verified:—

Pietro, se dai le chiavi a Gesù,
Non sperar che te le renda più.

A biography of Uhland ¶ by his widow is a valuable addition to the lives of the German poets. Like its subject, it is distinguished by simplicity and good taste. Uhland's life was not eventful, and nearly all the productive portion of it was comprised within a few years. During this period he was young and obscure; upon his attaining fame the source of inspiration dried up, and neither his tastes nor his social relations were such as to make him a potentate in the literary world. From purely patriotic motives he turned his attention to politics, and the vexations connected with an independent career at a period of servility and absolutism proved sufficient to extinguish any chance of his again finding utterance as a poet. He had, however, the consolation of attaining a high character for manly patriotism and incorruptible disinterestedness. The same national feeling which had led him to enter public life induced him to give great attention to the study of antique German poetry, to which his latter years were mainly devoted. This volume contains a considerable amount of interesting correspondence, and is altogether a worthy record of an admirable poet and exemplary citizen, too limited in his genius and sympathies to have largely influenced the literary history of his country, but occupying in it his own peculiar niche with such completeness as to have left no place for a rival or successor.

* *Geschichte der Belagerung von Paris*. Von E. Heyde und A. Froese. Th. 1. Berlin: Schneider. London: Trübner.

† *Cavour. Biographische Erinnerungen von Joseph Massari*. Uebersetzung von E. Bezold. Leipzig: Barth. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Der neue Plutarch. Biographien hervorragender Charaktere der Geschichte, Literatur und Kunst*. Herausgegeben von R. Gottschall. Th. 1. Leipzig: Brockhaus. London: Williams & Norgate.

§ *Otto von Guericke. Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Geschichte des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts*. Von F. W. Hoffmann. Herausgegeben von J. O. Opel. Magdeburg: Baeusch. London: Asher & Co.

|| *Die Papstwahl Innocenz XIII. Nach Original-Quellen*. Von Max Ritter von Mayer. Wien: Braumüller. London: Asher & Co.

¶ *Ludwig Uhland's Leben*. Aus dessen Nachlass und aus eigener Erinnerung zusammengestellt von seiner Wittve. Stuttgart: Cotta. London: Williams & Norgate.

Porson's epigram on Hermann*, though itself but a plagiarism from the Greek Anthology, has made the name of his rival familiar to many who, though no philologists, will still be glad to know what manner of man this particular German was. Professor Köchly's biography enables us to define him as a philologist of the old school—a bookworm if you looked merely to the narrow range of his professional pursuits and his exclusive devotion to them, a man of the world in force of character and strength of understanding. Among his chief characteristics were acuteness, simplicity, honesty, and a sturdy love of truth. The latter he especially showed in the weight he accorded to the objections against the Wolfian hypothesis of the origin of the Homeric poems, of which he was nevertheless a decided partisan. His life was wholly uneventful, and entirely engrossed by philological and academic interests. One of his duties as Professor at Leipsic, it is astonishing to hear, was that of censor of *belles-lettres*, in which capacity he had to read all the novels and poems published at that enormous book-mart. He was a still greater exception to the ordinary pursuits of German professorship in his fondness for equestrian exercise. The simplicity of Professor Köchly's biography is fully in keeping with the subject. It is clear, concise, methodical, all digressions and illustrations being banished to the notes, which constitute a varied and entertaining appendix. Among other interesting particulars, the writer gives an account of academical education in Saxony in his own younger days, and seems inclined to doubt whether the system has been improved as a whole. He admits, however, that mathematics and modern languages were neglected. The volume is adorned by a splendid portrait of Hermann, and contains reprints of some of his minor writings, such as official discourses and copies of Latin verse.

The publication of the minor works of another illustrious scholar is at length complete. The fourth volume of August Boeckh's† academical dissertations at Berlin, being the seventh and concluding volume of his smaller writings, contains no less than sixty-six Latin disquisitions, almost exclusively on minute points of Hellenic philology or archaeology. The most important perhaps are those on the reputed, but, as Boeckh thinks, imaginary, enmity of Plato and Xenophon, and on the date of Plato's "Republic." They also include numerous illustrations of the Attic dramatists and orators, with a few academical addresses.

A treatise on Logic, by H. Lotze‡, is designed as a prelude to a new system of metaphysical philosophy. Its scope is accordingly more extensive than that of a merely technical treatise on the subject.

The history of War to the death of Alexander the Great § is substantially the military history of Greece, our information respecting the organization and campaigns of other ancient nations up to that date being very imperfect. Prince Galitzin, however, has appended a sketch of the Roman and Carthaginian military systems on the eve of the appearance of those States as first-class Powers. The work, though formidable in extent and somewhat heavy in style, is nevertheless highly instructive, and interesting as an example of the application of criticism grounded on the principles of modern tactics to the accounts of the ancient historians.

With the publication of a volume on the Upper Jura, Dr. Brauns|| concludes his work on the geology and palæontology of the German portion of that range. From the geological period of the deposits, the book is necessarily in the main a contribution to fossil conchology.

Ernst Haeckel's long expected "Anthropogeny, or History of Human Development," ¶ is undoubtedly in some respects a great work. The leading conception of the human embryo as the miniature representation of the entire series of the development of life from the lowest to the highest animal organisms is lucidly expressed, vigorously enforced, and illustrated with a vast display of anatomical knowledge. The numerous defects of the work are perhaps reducible to the cardinal one of the author's character as a mere specialist, with no just appreciation of the problems which beset biological inquiry save in his own particular department of comparative anatomy. He has made out to his own satisfaction the anatomical links of affinity between the ascidian and the human race, and he seems to think nothing further necessary to justify the direct affiliation of the latter to the former. He does not consider that the graduation of forms is equally explicable on the hypothesis of an external agency working according to a preconceived plan, or of a plastic force immanent in all existence, and that if these, as must be conceded, are but precarious inferences from imperfectly understood phenomena, the capacity of anything to metamorphose itself into another thing is, until the transition has been actually observed, just such another questionable corollary. He would probably contend that Mr. Darwin's generalization has placed the matter on a different

* *Gottfried Hermann. Zu seiner hundertjährigen Geburtstage*. Von H. Köchly. Heidelberg: Winter. London: Asher & Co.

† *August Boeckh's gesammelte kleine Schriften*. Bd. 4. A. Boeckhii opuscula academica Berolinensia. Ediderunt F. Ascherson, E. Bratuscheck, P. Eichholtz. Lipsiae: Teubner. London: Asher & Co.

‡ *Logik. Drei Bücher vom Denken, vom Untersuchen und vom Erkennen*. Von H. Lotze. Leipzig: Hirzel. London: Williams & Norgate.

§ *Allgemeine Kriegsgeschichte des Alterthums*. Herausgegeben von Fürst N. S. Galitzin. Aus dem Russischen ins Deutsche übersetzt von Streecius. P. 1. Cassel: Kay. London: Williams & Norgate.

|| *Der obere Jura in nordwestlichen Deutschland*. Von D. Brauns. Braunschweig: Vieweg. London: Williams & Norgate.

¶ *Anthropogenie. Entwicklungsgeschichte des Menschen*. Von Ernst Haeckel. Leipzig: Engelmann. London: Williams & Norgate.

footing; but it is the misfortune of his book that he is compelled to refer habitually to the Darwinian theory as an established truth, without having space, or, as we suspect, inclination, to combat the numerous scruples which must present themselves to those who are even slightly acquainted with the literature of the subject. Assuming, as he needs must, a practically infinite period of geological time, he ignores the arguments by which natural philosophers, better authorities on such a point than natural historians, have endeavoured to demonstrate the physical impossibility of the proposition. He does not remark that all the incontestable evidence we possess of the agency of natural selection in the production of species tends at the same time to show that the scope of this agency is restricted; that the birds of oceanic islands, however modified from the parent type, are still birds; that the clear proof of the derivation of the North Asiatic and North American trees from the same stock fails to connect either with the lichen and the palm. He treats the organic character of the *Eozoon* as indisputable, though the controversy is notoriously in suspense. On the whole, the author's attainments fall short of the encyclopædic character which could alone have justified the extreme confidence and dogmatism of his language. As a contribution to a special branch of a vast investigation, his work is no doubt very valuable, and will probably tend to strengthen two growing convictions, that evolution actually is the key to the mystery of Nature, and that the secret of its application has as yet set human ingenuity at defiance.

E. Förstemann's history of the Teutonic family of languages* is divided into three sections—the first treating of the primitive Aryan language from which it took its rise; the second of the transition period previous to its definitive separation from the Slavonic branch of the family; the last of the language in its first recognisable Germanic form. The work is manifestly one of great research, and the author is a sound philologist, a pupil of Pott and Grimm. In his preface he speaks reprovingly of the speculative license indulged in since the death of the founders of comparative philology.

M. Hettrema's dictionary of the Frisian language† is principally extracted from old literary monuments, especially collections of laws. The resemblance of Frisian to our own language renders the work one of importance for English philology.

Dr. Koerting's essay on the literary history of Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius‡ is chiefly directed to the refutation of the now generally accepted theory that the Latin text of Dictys, the only form in which the book is at present extant, professedly a translation from the Greek, is in fact the original.

Dr. E. Schrader§ follows up his valuable researches in Assyrian science by the publication of a German version of the Deluge tablet discovered and interpreted by Mr. George Smith, with a philological commentary, and some interesting and judicious observations on the character and probable date of the composition. Dr. Schrader is not only an ingenious but a sound and wary scholar, averse to all rash theories, and content to defer to the authorities who have made the Assyrian inscriptions, for years so unaccountably neglected in Germany, their study for a longer period than he has done. The hymns and metrical charms published in the second part of his volume have for the most part been already translated by Mr. Fox Talbot and others; it is his merit to have made them accessible to a wider public, and to have contributed to the elucidation of doubtful points. Their resemblance to the Hebrew Psalms, alike in form and spirit, must strike all readers.

The great advantage of Wessely's Christian Iconography|| over former works of the same description is that, whereas the latter have merely indicated the symbols or attributes of saints or other personages represented in sacred art, Wessely's work adds the information where these delineations may be found, whether in paintings or engravings. The work is also far more copious than its predecessors; the author, however, modestly disclaims all idea of having exhausted his subject.

We have to record the completion, on a scale answerable to the magnificence of the beginning, of MM. Havard and Madou's admirable pictorial and literary illustrations of the architecture, costumes, and social life of the last four centuries¶, the commencement of which has been previously noticed by us. Another enterprising publication of M. Havard's is his collection of beautiful examples of domestic art, selected from the principal museums of Holland**, a book most beautifully executed, and of great interest to artists and amateurs.

It is remarkable that the editor of the "German Survey"††

* *Geschichte des deutschen Sprachstammes*. Von Ernst Förstemann. Nordhausen: Förstemann. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Idioticon Frisicum. Friesch-Latijnsch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek*. Door M. de Haan Hettrema. Leeuwarden: Surinjar. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Dictys und Dares*. Von Dr. G. Koerting. Halle: Niemeyer. London: Williams & Norgate.

§ *Die Hellenfahrt der Istar. Ein altbabylonisches Epos. Nebst Proben assyrischer Lyrik*. Von Dr. E. Schrader. Giessen: Richter. London: Williams & Norgate.

|| *Iconographie Gottes und der Heiligen*. Von J. E. Wessely. Leipzig: Weigel. London: Asher & Co.

¶ *Les quatre derniers Siècles. Étude artistique* par H. Havard illustrée par J. B. Madou. Haarlem: Schalekamp. London: Kolckmann.

** *Objets d'art et de curiosité, tirés des grandes collections hollandaises*. Par H. Havard. Haarlem: Schalekamp. London: Kolckmann.

†† *Deutsche Rundschau*. Herausgegeben von Julius Rodenberg. Hft. 1. Berlin: Paetel. London: Trübner.

should be able to describe his periodical as the first ever professedly devoted to the national culture as a whole, instead of to some special department. If this is really the case, it is high time that the deficiency should be supplied, and it is extremely satisfactory to find it promising to be supplied so well. Auerbach and T. Storm have contributed novelettes, the latter a work of real power. A narrative of the march of the German army upon Sedan is full of interest; and Professor von Sybel has written an account of the first partition of Poland, accurate in substance, but apologetic in tone. For this great political crime, as well as for all the other sins and follies of Germany, the Pope is made indirectly responsible. The most pleasing article of any is one embodying anecdotes and letters of the great painter Kaulbach, highly characteristic of his unaffected and independent character. Foreign disciples of Wagner will be interested by an account of the recent performance of *Tristan and Isolde* at Weimar. On the whole, the new periodical has made an excellent beginning, and only needs to be continued with equal ability to achieve a decided success. The weakest point of the present number is a tendency to indiscriminate panegyric in the literary notices, bearing a suspicious resemblance to *camaraderie*.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 6d., or \$7 50 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 17 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 990, OCTOBER 17, 1874:

Italy.	The Spanish Note.	Current Politics.
	Political Tuss and Marshal MacMahon.	The Duke of Padua.
	The London Gas Companies.	Wife Murder.
	The Policy of the Local Government Board.	
	Clerical Amusements.	Fastoff as a Stepfather.
	The Church Congress at Brighton.	The Abolition of Second Class.
A Day with the Fungus-Hunters.	Report of the Universities Commission.	
	The Law of Compensation.	Dancing Licences.
	The Growth of Incomes in Prussia.	
	The Cesarewitch and Middle Park Plate.	
	Life of Lord Palmerston.	
	The Church of the Revolution.	Sheridan's Works.
Minto's Characteristics of English Poets.	The Best of Husbands.	
Friends of Chateaubriand.	Roby's Latin Grammar.	Woman's a Riddle.
Neate's Specimens of Composition.	German Literature.	

CONTENTS OF No. 989, OCTOBER 10, 1874:

Count Armin's Imprisonment—The Northampton Election—The Regent's Park Explosion—Mr. Chamberlain on the Liberal Programme—French Elections—County Speeches—Arbitration and Social Science—The Flight of the Irish Clergy.	
Travelling Companions—The Goths—The Furness District—Ultramontaniam and Science—Homburg and Baden—A Sensible Sermon—The Church of St. Francis at Assisi—Party War in New York—Newmarket First October Meeting.	
The Transit of Venus—Delannay's Græco-Jewish Monks and Sibilys—The Moltke Narrative of Gravelotte—A Rose in June—Nature's Revelations of Character—Fordon's Chronicle of Scotland—Things a Lady would Like to Know—Lower's Wayside Notes in Scandinavia—Mortomley's Estate.	

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

ST. JAMES'S THEATRE, King Street, Pall Mall, entirely Redecorated, from Designs by J. T. Robinson, Architect, will RE-OPEN on SATURDAY next, October 21, with A GUARDIAN ANGEL, Comedietta by John Oxenford and Joseph Hutton; and a new Comedy-Bouffe, in three acts, the Music by Charles Lecocq, the Libretto by H. B. Farnie, entitled THE BLACK PRINCE, supported by Mesdames Selina Dolaro, Nelly Bromley, Emily Duncan, Louise Howard, Essie Hollingshead, Inez d'Aquilar, Linda Verner, Messrs. John L. Hall, John Rouse, C. W. Norton, J. Layton, H. Clifford, and Mr. Chatterton, with full Chorus and Ballet, and specially selected Orchestra, conducted by Herr Schoening. New Scenery by Græve. New Costumes by Madame Elise, Madame White, Gask and Gask, Poole, Skinner (of Jermyn Street), Auguste et Cie, and May New Properties by Labhart, and Henry Castle & Sons. A new Stall Entrance, a new Stall Smoking Saloon, and a new Smoking Conservatory have been constructed. Box-Office open from Ten to Five. Seats may also be booked at all Libraries and by letter. Private Boxes, 42s.; Stalls, 7s. 6d.; Dress Circle, 3s. 6d.; Family Circle, 2s. 6d.; Amphitheatre, 1s.

DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE of "CHRIST LEAVING the PRETORIUM," with "The Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Night of the Crucifixion," "Christian Martyrs," "Francesca da Rimini," "Andromeda," &c., at the DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Ten to Six.—Admission, 1s.

HYDE PARK COLLEGE for LADIES, 115 Gloucester Terrace, Hyde Park.

The SENIOR TERM begins November 2.

The JUNIOR HALF-TERM November 2.

Prospectuses, containing Terms, Names of Professors, &c., may be had on application to the LADY-HEADMASTER.

MALVERN COLLEGE.

This College contains two Departments—the CLASSICAL and the MODERN. There is also a preparatory LOWER SCHOOL.

There are Boarding-Houses within the College Grounds, held by the Head-Master and others of his Staff; a Gymnasium, &c.

Board and Tuition under Fourteen, £50; over Fourteen, £50. Non-Shareholders pay an extra Fee of £5. Special advantages for Sons of Clergymen and Home Boarders.

For further information, apply to the Rev. ARTHUR FABER, M.A., Head-Master, late Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford.

The Examination for Scholarships and Exhibitions on December 22 and 23.

MALVERN COLLEGE.

The ANNUAL EXAMINATION for SCHOLARSHIPS and EXHIBITIONS will be held on December 22 and 23. There will be awarded Six House Scholarships of £50. Four Founders' Scholarships of £50, and some Exhibitions of £30. The Awards will be for one, or for two years, according to merit, in Classics or Mathematics. For particulars apply to the HEAD-MASTER.

ELIZABETH COLLEGE, GUERNSEY.

Visitor—The BISHOP of WINCHESTER.

Valuable University Scholarships and College Exhibitions for annual competition. Special attention paid to Modern Languages and the Preparation of Candidates for Woolwich, Cooper's Hill, Control Department, Army and Navy, and Civil Service.

ARMY, WOOLWICH, COOPER'S HILL.—MORGAN JENKINS, M.A. (Wangler), assisted by an able Staff of Graduates in First-class Honours (including a Second in First Class of Nat. Sci. Tripos), prepares RESIDENT and NON-RESIDENT PUPILS for the above. Four out of Six sent up for Cooper's Hill, the only Pupils for Woolwich, and Three out of Four for the last Line Examination have passed.

Address, 50 Cornwall Road, Westbourne Park.

FOLKESTONE.—Mr. W. J. JEAFFRESON, M.A. Oxon.

(formerly Principal of the Elphinstone High School, Bombay), with the Assistance of a Cambridge Honours-Man, prepares PUPILS for the Universities, Indian Civil Service, Woolwich, and all Competitive Examinations.—Terms and References on application.

STANFIELD HOUSE, Green Hill, Hampstead.—Mr. T. M. JACOMBS, A.K.C.

assisted by Eminent Masters, receives into his house a very select number of PUPILS to Educate or to Prepare for the Public Schools, into nearly all of which Boys have been passed by him to high forms. The House and Grounds are spacious and healthy situated near the Heath. Highest references may be obtained from the Nobility and Clergy whose Sons Mr. JACOMBS has educated. Further particulars on application.

PRIVATE TUITION for ARMY, COOPER'S HILL, CIVIL SERVICE, WOOLWICH, and UNIVERSITIES.—Rev. Dr. HUGHES (Wring, Cam.)

who has passed over 300, has VACANCIES. Also quite distinct young Boys.—Ealing, W.

DELICATE or BACKWARD BOYS.—A GRADUATE of

Trin. Coll., Cam., Married, an old Rugbyman, will have a VACANCY for ONE PUPIL, the middle of the present month. He offers Classics, Mathematics, French, and thorough German, and every care and Home Comfort for Delicate Boys; and, if desired, Hunting, Shooting, and Fishing. Terms, 150 to 250 Guineas.—Address, Rev. R. H. L., Holdgate Rectory, Much Wenlock.

TO PARENTS seeking the HIGHEST-CLASS EDUCATION

for their DAUGHTERS.—A GENTLEWOMAN, residing near the Crystal Palace, offers a very Superior House to Three or Four YOUNG LADIES desirous of completing their Education by the Private Tutorial Instruction available in the Crystal Palace School of Art and Literature, where the most distinguished Teachers attend, and where the Advertiser can give the necessary vouchers for Introductions. Terms, all inclusive, 200 Guineas per Annum.—Address, A. B. C., care of Mr. Fricker, Estate Agent, Westow Hill, Upper Norwood.

A GENTLEMAN wishes to place his SON, an intelligent and

well-taught Deaf and Dumb Youth of Seventeen, with an able and conscientious TUTOR, residing in the neighbourhood of London, Oxford, or Edinburgh, who would carry on his Education in Classics, Mathematics, a guarded and useful French, and have a healthy, bracing situation would be essential.—Communications to be addressed, S. M., Post-Office, Bradford, Yorkshire.

TRANSFER of SCHOOL PROPERTY.—A CLERGYMAN,

who has long conducted a FIRST-RATE ESTABLISHMENT, with Pupils at high terms, wishes to DISPOSE of it to a Gentleman with a small capital at command.—Address, M. A., 85 Brecknock Road, Tufnell Park, N.

MALVERN.—HYDROPATHY.—Dr. RAYNER'S ESTAB-

LISHMENT (formerly Drs. Wilson and Rayner). For prospectus apply to T. RAYNER, M.D., Malvern.

HYDROPATHY.—SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill.

Physician—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D., Edin.

For Invalids and those requiring rest and change. Turkish Baths on the premises.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Facing Sea and

Esplanade. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Suites of Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel.

ROBERT PARK, Manager.

ILFRACOMBE HOTEL, Ilfracombe, North Devon.—Delightful

Location. Beautiful Scenery. 250 Rooms. Appointments perfect. Cuisine excellent. Wines choice. Accessible from all parts by Steam and Rail (see Time Tables).

MARGATE.—The CARLTON HOTEL, facing the Sea, open

all the year at one charge. Boarders, £3 3s. per Week. Breakfast at 9 o'clock A.M.; Luncheon at 1; Dinner at 6. Tea and Coffee served at 9 P.M. in a most splendid Drawing-room. The Drawing-room, with its ample Balcony, is open all day from 10 A.M. to 11 P.M. A good Piano. To keep the Hotel very select references are required a few days before entrance.

R. KERR, Proprietor.

JAMES BLACKWOOD & CO., Publishers.—MANUSCRIPTS

and REPRINTS now received for the Winter Season. Estimates given, and prompt attention to all communications.—5 Lovell's Court, Paternoster Row.

PUBLICATION of EDUCATIONAL WORKS.—All

AUTHORS desirous of bringing their WORKS under the direct notice of the Scholaristic Profession are informed that KILFE BROTHERS have unusual opportunities of assisting them in this respect, as their Travellers, who visit the greater part of England twice a year, call on all the principal Educational Establishments in the Kingdom, and by this means introduce, in the most efficient way, all Books committed to their care.—6 Charterhouse Buildings, Aldersgate, E.C.

RODRIGUES' MONOGRAMS, ARMS, CRESTS, and

ADDRESSES Designed, and Steel Dies Engraved as Gems.

RAISED, RUSTIC, GRATE-AQUE, and ECCENTRIC MONOGRAMS artistically designed for any combination of Letters. NOTE PAPER and ENVELOPES stamped in Colour Relief, and brilliantly Illuminated in Gold, Silver, and Colours, in the highest Style of Art.

At HENRY RODRIGUES', 42 PICCADILLY, LONDON.

E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, and 34 Royal Exchange, Manufacture

of CHRONOMETERS, WATCHES, ASTRONOMICAL and TUBET CLOCKS, to Her Majesty, H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, and H.M. the Emperor of Russia; Makers of the Great Clock of the Houses of Parliament, and of the New Standard Clock of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich. Catalogues on application.—E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, 34 Royal Exchange (adjoining Lloyd's), and Factory, Savoy Street, London.

THE ASTRONOMER-ROYAL Reported to the Admiralty

(August 13, 1870) on 40 Chronometers entered for annual competition, "M. F. DENT" is the highest we have ever had on trial.—M. F. DENT, Chronometer, Watch, and Clock Maker to the Queen, 33 COCKSPUR STREET, CHARING CROSS.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE at DEANE & COMPANY'S.

Illustrated Catalogue, with priced Furnishing List, post free.

Table Knives, Ivory, per dozen, from 15s. Electro Forks, Table, from 25s.; Spoons, 25s. Papier-Mâché Tea Trays, in Sets, from 25s. Electro Tea and Coffee Sets, from £3 7s. Dish Covers.—Trin. Coll., Cam., Married, an old Rugbyman, will have a VACANCY for ONE PUPIL, the middle of the present month. He offers Classics, Mathematics, French, and thorough German, and every care and Home Comfort for Delicate Boys; and, if desired, Hunting, Shooting, and Fishing. Terms, 150 to 250 Guineas.—Address, Rev. R. H. L., Holdgate Rectory, Much Wenlock.

Lamps—Patent Rock Oil, Moderator, &c. Bronzed Tea and Coffee Urns. China and Glass—Dinner Services, &c.

A Discount of Five per cent. for Cash Payments of £2 and upwards.

DEANE & COMPANY, 46 King William Street, London Bridge, E.C. Established A.D. 1700.

THE PERFECT SUBSTITUTE for SILVER.—The real

NICKEL SILVER, introduced more than Thirty Years ago by WILLIAM S. BURTON, when Messrs. Elkington & Co. introduced the best article next to silver that can be employed as such, either usefully or ornamentally, as by no test can it be distinguished from real silver.

A small useful Set, guaranteed of first quality for finish and durability, as follows:—

PATTERNS.	Fiddle or Old Silver.	Band or Thread.	King's or Shell.
12 Table Forks.....	£ s. d. 1 10 -	£ s. d. 3 1 -	£ s. d. 3 5 -
12 Table Spoons.....	1 10 -	3 1 -	3 5 -
12 Dessert Forks.....	1 2 -	1 9 -	1 11 -
12 Dessert Spoons.....	1 2 -	1 9 -	1 11 -
12 Tea Spoons.....	1 14 -	1 -	1 2 -
6 Egg Spoons, gilt bowls.....	9 -	12 -	13 6 -
2 Sauce Ladles.....	6 -	8 -	9 -
1 Gravy Spoon.....	6 -	8 -	9 -
2 Salt Spoons, gilt bowls.....	3 -	4 -	4 6 -
1 Mustard Spoon, gilt bowl.....	1 6 -	2 -	2 3 -
1 Pair of Sugar Tongs.....	3 6 -	3 6 -	4 -
1 Pair of Fish Carvers.....	2 6 -	3 6 -	3 4 6 -
1 Butter Knife.....	2 9 -	3 6 -	3 9 -
1 Soup Ladle.....	9 -	11 -	12 -
1 Sugar Sifter.....	3 -	4 -	4 -
Total.....	8 19 3	11 19 6	13 0 6

Any Article to be had singly at the same Prices. An Oak Chest to contain the above, and a relative number of Knives, &c., £2 15s. A Second Quality of Fiddle Pattern:—

Tea and Coffee Sets, Electro-Silver on White Metal, £3 10s. to £25.

Dish Covers, Electro-Silver on Nickel, £10 to £25. A Set of Four, plain elegant Pattern, £3. A Set of Four, Beaded Pattern, £10 10s. A Set of Four, Fluted Pattern, £12 10s. Chased and Engraved Patterns, from £14 to £25. Corner Dishes, Electro Silver, from £7 10s. to £15 10s. The Set of Four, Warmers, £2 5s. to £4 15s. Bisquit Boxes, 18s. to £2 10s.

Cruet Frames, Electro-Silver—Three Glasses, 12s. to £3 6s. Four Glasses, 15s. to £3 15s. Six Glasses, 21s. to £4 16s. Seven Glasses, £1 18s. to £7 10s.

Dessert Fruit Knives and Forks, from 5s. to £9 12s. the dozen pairs. Cases, from 8s.

Fish Eaters.—Knives, from 4s. to 9s. the dozen. Knives and Forks, from £4 4s. to £8 4s. 3d. the dozen pairs. Cases, from 8s. and 15s. Fish Carvers, in Cases, from 15s. to 54s. the Pair.

All kinds of Replating done by the Patent Process.

WILLIAM S. BURTON, General Furnishing Ironmonger, by appointment to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE, containing upwards of 500 Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock, with Lists of Prices and Plans of the 30 large Show-rooms, post free.

30 Oxford Street, W. 1. 1A, 2, 3, and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5, and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman Yard, London, W. The Cost of delivering Goods to the most distant parts of the United Kingdom by Railway is trifling. WILLIAM S. BURTON will always undertake delivery at a small fixed rate.

MAPPIN & WEBB'S**A 1 SPOONS and FORKS.****GUARANTEED to LAST****TWENTY YEARS. A WRITTEN GUARANTEE GIVEN**

TO EVERY PURCHASER.

NOS. 76, 77, and 78 OXFORD STREET, WEST END, LONDON.

MANSHION HOUSE BUILDINGS,

QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, CITY, LONDON.

MANUFACTORY AND SHOW ROOMS,

THE ROYAL CUTLERY WORKS, SHEFFIELD.

COSTLY ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUES ON RECEIPT OF 15 STAMPS.

SMALLER EDITION POST FREE.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE or APARTMENTS

THROUGHOUT on MOORE'S HIRE SYSTEM. Cash Prices; no Extra Charges.

Large, useful Stock to select from. All Goods Warranted. Illustrated priced Catalogue, with Terms, post free.—249 and 250 Tottenham Court Road. Established 1862.

CARPETS.

MESSRS. SMEE have now for SALE in this Department a certain number of

REMNANT LENGTHS and MADE-UP CARPETS.

Which are offered (for such quantities only of each pattern as may be in Stock) at

CONSIDERABLY REDUCED PRICES FOR CASH, WITHOUT DISCOUNT.

6 FINSBURY PAVEMENT, LONDON.

GOOD FLOOR CLOTH.—TRELOAR & SONS,

69 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

CLARK'S PATENT STEEL NOISELESS SHUTTERS,

Self-Colling, Fire and Thief Proof, can be adapted to any Window or other Opening.

Prospectuses free.—CLARK & CO., Sole Patentees, Rathbone Place, W.; Paris, Manchester, Liverpool, and Dublin.

H. J. NICOLL, Merchant Clothier to the Queen, the Royal

Family, and the Courts of Europe; Army, Navy, and Civil Outfitter, 114, 116, 118, 120 Regent Street, and 22 Cornhill, London. Also Branch Establishments at Manchester, 10 Mosley Street; Liverpool, 50 Bold Street; and Birmingham, 39 New Street.

The EARLIER FASHIONS for the approaching WINTER

are now ready, and to be had at the above addresses. The Stock will be found to embrace all that is novel and improved in Style, in combination with Materials of sterling value and good wearing qualities, while the make and finish of each Article are attended to with great care.

FOR GENTLEMEN.—Several Fashionable Novelties in Style

and Material for OVERCOATS are prepared. Very choice Fabrics for Frock and Morning Coats, &c. Homespun Cheviots for Suits. Distinguished Patterns in Angoras for Trouserings.

FOR BOYS.—Very tasteful DESIGNS in SUITS, &c., for

Younger Boys; and "Regulation" Suits, as worn at Eton, Harrow, Rugby, and other great Schools. Shirts, Hosiery, Hats, &c., suitable for each Dress.

FOR LADIES.—Several new DESIGNS in POLONAISE

COSTUMES and JACKETS, amongst which are the "Beatrice" and "Russian Navy." Being made of Woolen Fabrics, the same skill in fitting and workmanship is required as in the production of Gentlemen's Clothing and Ladies' Riding Habits. The Ladies' Ulster "Dreadnought," with Self-Contracting Waist-Belt, introduced and registered by H. J. NICOLL, for Walking or Travelling, is rain-repellent, and yet thoroughly evaporable.

To be had only at H. J. NICOLL'S several Addresses, 114, 116, 118, 120 Regent Street, and 22 Cornhill, London; 10 Mosley Street, Manchester; 50 Bold Street, Liverpool; and 39 New Street, Birmingham.

HIGH-CLASS FASHIONABLE CLOTHING FOR GENTLEMEN PAYING CASH.

LAWRENCE D. PHILLIPS & CO., COURT and MILITARY TAILORS,

15 GEORGE STREET, HANOVER SQUARE, LONDON, W.

A Fashionable Order Trade of the highest class, established for half-a-century on the credit system, but now doing business exclusively for ready money payment, and supplying Clothes and Uniforms of the best quality, to Order only, at moderate prices.

Lists on application.

FOR THE COLD BATH, &c. &c.**CASH'S KNITTED****ROUGH TOWELS**

CAN BE ORDERED THROUGH HOSIERS and DRAPERS, &c., EVERYWHERE.

IRON WINE BINS.—VIENNA MEDAL awarded to

FARROW & JACKSON, 16 Great Tower Street, and 8 Haymarket, London, to whom is now transferred the sale of Barlow's Cask Stands and syphon Taps, from 14 King William Street.